

A Flexible Anarcho
A Study in Acceleration
Epistemological
Reformatting and
Defense for Soft
Constructions
of Self



R

P

M

D

9

S

I

R

O

84

O

C

E

I

P

P

A

B

P

L

a flexible anarchy

a study in accelerated epistemological reformatting
and defense for a soft construction of self

this text was collectively written by The Actual School in participation with its 2015 seminar entitled A Flexible Anarchy; it is released by Reflexes; other works regarding this topic and composed for this seminar include reformatting.net, Nick James' Airbnb Sutras, Arx's New American Apparel, and User's Daemons

TABLE OF CONTENTS

5	Table of contents
6	An abstract and thesis
9	A defense <i>via media, a system's output, concretization of difference, soft disruption, anarcho-flexion</i>
37	A methodology <i>filtration, filters, procedure, formulae</i>
49	A study <i>accumulation, development, acquisition, transference, discourse, adaptation, uniformity, comprehension, reification, authority, opposition, optimization, resistance, authorization, systemization, affirmation, disassociation, intentionality, reform, neutralization, substantiation, access, justification, amplification, justice, regulation, discipline, exodus, nothingness, conception, precision, categorization, reason, accelerated reformatting, anarchy, flexibility</i>
160	A conclusion

ABSTRACT AND THESIS

The constant ordering of a remnant-self, one that both recognizes its format and reformats with an unknowing fluctuation of loss and gain, is a continuum within which epistemology parlays interior property into totalistic expressions. These remnants constructed into momentary formations of self via filters of what it owns and what it represents; these two filters, in the reformatting, are able to modify the constructor moment-to-moment (or upon any recognition of ulterior semiosis) by approaching any given interposition that occurs in their difference, which is in turn a further filtration. This is an approach which develops dynamic identities for the self out of the inherent and residual programmings available within any laboring: a flexibility. Having a flexibility when formatting, and perhaps more importantly when reformatting, allows for an acceleration of both the semiotically tracked tendency one might have to be crippled by the program as well as the hardness of a logic that is produced within systems of hierarchical control: the self is not constructed “for,” “as,” or “because,” but rather “at,” “towards,” and “in.” A constructed self, then, is a spatiotemporal eradication of semiotic certainty. It drifts, filters, changes and, ultimately, revolts.

That a self is constructed — perhaps even with a notional, albeit faulty, ascertainment that it is so

permanently or essentially — implies that it is soft: rightfully able to change its maximal condition based on the tactical movement of perception and action. This flexibility of humanity is ultimately a social, political, and axiological motion towards a non-state of oppression, disruptive of both the illegitimate state through which necessary ownership becomes pathological and of the interior processes that are engrained by experience as signifiers of identity: alienated or not. This is, ultimately, our account of an anarchical freedom of self situated in the reticulation of structural pliancy, disruptive inquiry into the hierarchical base, and experiential identity altered in infinite repetition by abstract exchanges. Anarchy is a state of control that contests the construction of any system (self included) institutionalizing the prohibition of expression. Ultimately, this is the current modus for any self concerned with identity. What we are paying attention to in this work is the exchange that occurs via self between any given maximal condition and the remnants which are in constant movement: formatting. To format anarchically is to accelerate the rate at which the self is bent away from interiorly assessed assuredness in order to generate a detachment of exclusionary ownership over that self and the spaces in which it “is.”

This experimental work offers a machine that can be applied to that exchange. It consists of nine filters that can both engage in the deconstructions of difference, as well as produce flexible anarchies

within a systemic humanity that proliferates the view that attachment is progress. Our soft construction of self, which challenges any alienated epistemological paradigm, mechanically allows an acceleration within both participatory arenas and quietized passivities. Applying filters of anarchy to any given epistemology will allow for the formatting of personhood (a brave proclamation) and the reformatting of any illegitimate containments therein. This is not a call for exodus, but a desistance from exclusion and, therefore, a sensation producing new life.

Our goal is to disrupt the static formatting of self construction. In an effort to reorient epistemology as “a flexible anarchy,” we offer a machine of nine filters that organize sociological, philosophical, and action-based strategies of construction that attempt to express the self as a static entity. Ultimately, all constructive efforts are meaningful; and, we argue for an accelerated, re-combinative filtration of self that can provide helpful liquidation toward a tactical, total epistemology.

a defense for a soft construction of self

VIA MEDIA

A girl who lives near the coast looks out at the ocean. Perhaps at one point in time she could describe her unique relationship to the ocean in terms of unification, though fragmentation has occurred through an onset of difference. Within the sameness of unification, the ocean could be *her* ocean, or her ocean could be the *only* ocean; within the difference, *an* ocean becomes *the* ocean: a clever divide, conditional unto the merits of a species. Her development is in constantly relative parallax to her experience growing up, when the ocean's constant companionship ignited her. It was the informant for substantive meaning, its omnipresence being instrumental to her construction of self.

It is this construction of self that moves us to confront the girl, the ocean, and their differences of being. Their ever-changing coordinates of selfhood are not lost by change, but real due to change. Doing this type of analysis, using specific filtering methods to organize socio-philosophy, bares witness to a confrontation not only of the self's prowess of "itself," but of any assumption rooted firmly in the sacrosanctity of difference. The construction we are considering is not entirely one that is cumulatively behavioral, diachronically enclosed, or dialectically performative. In fact, it is difficult to criticize these human aspirations for knowing self without removing the conjecture of self all-together in the process.

No, rather, we are considering a construction that autopoietically performs self and, thus, the act of being contains a surplus beyond pragmatism. What we reduce to is the motilities of a construction, benefiting entirely from our production of being.

When our young girl constructed herself through introjections of oceanic symbolism, through the autopoieses of construction, a language was developed regarding the maturation of materiality: the girl's and the sea's. With this, the temporal application is irrelevant. Here, the language maintains self. Perhaps the girl could rationalize sameness at one point, but under her survivalistically mutative condition — one that excitingly includes the abilities of cognition — the semiotic transference of knowingness (language) removes the unadulterated silent-language of sameness, replacing it with taxologies of difference. The language that lends itself to the biologies of finitude, inter-mechanic psychologies, and multi-personal dramatics allows for an accelerated translation of the interface of sameness by subjecting it to difference. The ability to epistemologically flip apperceptions of objects due to a language of attributing that which is an “externalization” does not contest the original material of its render. Rather, flipping apperceptions alters the being of self. Thus, languages differential to an exterior must systemize an incredible amount of experience as something other than itself. This is neither new nor challenging for considering epistemology. Even

so, the rapidity of flipping semiotically-entrenched views on the particularizing function of ontological reality is neither relevant to this confrontation or to philosophical confliction in general. The point of tangency which develops intrigue, developed herein, is the language that is massified in regards to the acceleration of epistemology. Acceleration is an occurrent property of experience, but the language that is semiotically catering to it — being iterated by the masses mimetically — creates real acceleration. Why are these different: occurrent acceleration and real acceleration? In short, the language of epistemology is secured in its tradition; and, the language of acceleration is secured in its passive rhetoric. Their amalgam as a centrism produces acts of epistemological acceleration, not merely action. Therefore, that which is real is epistemologically located; and any witness of acceleration relativizes its symbol.

Of course, it is now that we witness an ingression of the use of a massified language — a general language of and for the people — that is concerned with the ability to know. Moreover, the people are concerned with the ability to know becoming accelerated past the point of their own abilities to know, both by will and by force — a labor. This is a concern for some who consider this witness to an acceleration of the ability to know as the loss of a centralized self, a self constructed out of its unique abilities and combinative knowledge. With this language comes actual panic, actual eagerness for change, and actual

confusion on the behalf of those comfortable in the formats of non-identified accelerations. When we discuss this massified language of acceleration, we so too bring about the acceleration itself, or stated more clearly: this real acceleration is not something to be known, but something that is already articulated. The massive awareness of any epistemological quickening dislocates the mind from its temporal experience by locating the movement out of self within the center of the occurrent. Such, the ocean becomes tragically external to the young girl — a silent situational reality amplified unto the general public. Though the young girl was aided in development by her own notions of ocean-as-self projection, at some point in time it ceases by-and-large being a relatable object for her: the emotion can be there, but the surplus is diminished. When this type of construction is reduced, difference transforms unique observations like a youth might introject during maturation, into pragmatic observations like “the ocean makes up the majority of the earth’s globe,” or the even simpler, “we should go swimming today.” The ocean becomes either a symbol within a generalized symbolic network or becomes of use.

If epistemological acceleration is a symbol within a generalized symbolism, then a once vicarious silence is challenged to voice itself: the sessility of observance is mobilized, thus compromising the autopoieses of a systemic humanity (in regards to the aforementioned ability to know). By this, it is meant that any epistemological perspective that is confronted with

a reorientation will so too be forced to redefine the meaning and use of both situations and objects. With this, the surplus is revealed. The human that accepts the symbolism of accelerated epistemology moves on to attributing a use for it. This human, who has incorporated ocean into their idea of self (unification) due to the malleability of confrontation, relates explicitly to fluctuating non-demography. For one, we are constantly perceiving demographics in analyzing or even considering our relationship to an oceanic flood which is escaping difference — fluctuating demographical information accelerates self until self does not have to be “in-itself.” It is only made real by its contact with action (change). We may even feel that an inclination to semiotize the non-self that is rapidly encircling “itself” is an act of constructing authenticity: that our fixed identity affirms itself *en route*. It is here that we develop our position: a need to reformat at the interchange of a post-accelerated epistemology which uses the flight-of-self to become self again.

A SYSTEM’S OUTPUT

We are observing the systems of self. In doing so, we are not attributing a singular system to the epistemology which derives and constructs self. Rather, we are allowing for any and all systems that operate through self to enact self, or perform self, upon their collective output. This is a revolutionary model that introduces a successive *locum-of-self*

in indefinite repetition. In this sense, a system exists solely based on that which it does, or that which is done unto it; and, in the logic of labor, all combinations of proximal materials do. Thus, it is fair when discussing epistemology to question whether we are constructing self out of the paraphrases encountered along an epistemological continuum: symbol after symbol, note after note, confliction after confliction. It is also fair to say that the construction of relations — say to the ocean, to difference, or, to a reflexive relation with self — develops self. With the latter, the self is able to organize seemingly random demographics as systemic outputs, ultimately providing an ekstasis from fixed personhood, a flight-of-self. In other words, if the self is the systemic outputting of selves (what is worn, spoken, felt, thought, revealed, owned, represented), there appears to be cause for concern regarding 1. the information transformed into self (the reductive interiorization of exteriors, praxis, the self that is auto-defined), 2. the export of selves as they are received relationally, and perhaps more importantly, relativistically (the productive exteriorization of interiors, defined by what is done), and, 3. the absent simulation of self as that very same self (the productive exteriorization of non-applicable interiors, defined by what the self is not).

The consideration that the self is systemic and given upon the output of material labor implies acceleration. A system will attempt to produce an outcome; its reasoning for aggregation is bound

by this hope. Whether this outcome is semiotized as idealistic, materialistic, real, virtual, etc. makes no difference to the system. Epistemology is the procedure of any system towards whatever it may be referring to through its output in any given moment. This is to say that a system — withholding elements that are towards itself totalistically — is incapable of a full consideration of its innards' impetus. For example, capitalism is unable to read humanity without bilateral resourcing, a body has day-to-day ignorance of its organs, or, ocean is symbolic of ecosystemic intensity. The breadth of a contingency which denotes output as the systemic articulation of self contains both the import of a philosophical analysis (purpose, necessity, rationale, reason, risk, alterity) as well as the occlusion of a wide marginal influence (excluding putative observations because there is no guarantee of system-to-outcome adequation). In this sense, the attributive realism of systems elasticize idealism to the extreme of absolutism and even to the deficit of solipsism: the attribute is not what matters but rather the engagement with a moment as a real entity. These two attributions form tense, natural dynamics. Though an outcome is considered and often achieved by a system, any access to external difference is shackled and ultimately prevented. Thus, epistemology becomes insular and internally stunted. How can a system which is aware of its own usefulness liquidate the mutual-exclusivity of identity? With this schismatic contingency comes 1. dominance, 2. the illegitimate manifestation of quality divisions, and

3. the continuous resumption of tasking, day in and day out. This is not to say that a laboring system is a negative milieu of its components. Rather, a laboring system is an irremediable situation of ignoring micro-tendencies — in short, self. What is being ignored in a system concerned with the specification of its outcome is the impetus of its components. Such, a system is constructed by the (hopefully) careful assemblage of constitutive expressions.

At some point a system derives a knowingness of self, an autopoiesis of selfhood. While this self is produced by systemic outputting, the magnitude of systems at work are unnoticed. This neither downplays nor signifies the self, but rather it exposes a unified panorama of any given object under the condition of self: the self is as the selves do. Or even more poetically, the machinic operation transmogrifies apperceived difference through the *equalization of being*. Therefore, the pace of content under surveillance by a given self is occurrently accelerated. The systemic temporality of exchange (from output to output, a revolution) is such that the analytics are unobtainable without the concepts, paraphrases, and symbols. This draws real attention to the surpluses of both the systems and objects which are perceived as unified, yet systemically machinic. It is here that we again consider the massified language of accelerated epistemology. Instead of viewing the post-accelerated self as towards (a positive movement directed at a non-self, or locum-of-self), it may be more appropriate to analyze the totality

in relation to all perceivable demographics giving way to its fluidity of self. This is reformatting. Stated alternatively, if the self is formed by the constant revolution of productive and systemic labor, it must use a semiotic system to reformat the three aforementioned demographic constitutions of self: (1. the self *is* upon articulation, 2. the self is what it has, 3. the self is what it is not). This is done in order to analyze the point at which this is apperceivable by the self (epistemology). The decision to reify a singular discovery of personhood, or oceanhood, matters as much (and as little) as a single shell on the shore. Its meaning is limitless, its use...verbatim. The self, which has developed a use for the semiotics of acceleration, must then install a reformatting in order for the sessile self's new mobilization to continue movements of radicalization.

The order reads as such: systemic output, epistemology, accelerated epistemology, reformatting. Reformatting is labor that demands the discipline of filtration. It ensures that self is able to both take flight from the suffering of attachment (to self, to exclusions of ownership) and the suffering of dominance by hierarchical systems that prevent the flipping of self (cultural, identity, sexuality, user profiling). Reformatting, can be seen as a mode of detachment in line with the revolutionary model. If the self is known to the self, it develops a semiotization of the systemic machines that produce its own output. It reformats itself so that it is not bound to the overcoding of identity necessary to

an epistemological species without a language for acceleration. This overcoding is a systemic approach to demographical input and output that is developed to produce abstract renditions of social value, historical procedure, and diligent civility. Thus, the self is, much like the system within which it exists, constructed. The self is constructed, the connection of that self to other constructions is constructed, and the interpositional trademarks of discordance with previously affirmed construction is constructed. Change is possible and fundamental; reformatting is the methodology towards sustainable change.

Consider the self as a pyrosome, a salp, a pelagic (free-swimming) tunicate. The pyrosome is a colony of tiny animals — capable of forming giant hollow tubes that float along the bottom of the ocean as self-contained, self-referential ecosystems. Of course, the self is similar in its organization of impressions, the facile, empiricist “tabula rasa” claim that we inherit impressions, sensations, and eventual ideas through the process of sensation and their internal formulation into complex, abstract ideas. The pyrosome is abstract — it’s a tube of animals — irrerecognizable from the tiny salp that links with its neighbors. The form and shape of the tube bears no resemblance to the organism of the salp; yet, there is likely a biologically determined reason (we assume) as to why they created the tubular shape in the first place. Considering a more complex necessity or determinism — the complexity and plasticity of human mind — we can rest easy knowing that despite

our attempts to concretely organize our experience, our ideas don't need to summate to a tube floating along the bottom of the ocean. If the pyrosome is minima to the larger ocean, its entire ecosystem contains waves of macro/micro dominance that are determined by biologically necessitated function. Those environmental conditions are essential; but, in the ecosystem of accelerated virtuality, where epistemology has no even footing, how are we to suggest a deterministic view of demographical, socialized, "hard" constructions of self? Yes, the ocean can become known to us through consistent reification of its purpose, gaining meaning through how it relates to the mind, the body, the environment, the conditions of experience that contain the live creature. But herein, we are arguing for the soft construction possible when that solitary relationship is disrupted, when the possibility of infinitude regarding epistemological relationships with ocean are at least "considered," and potentially even utilized. This is the coexisting of multiplicitous "knowings" of ocean — reformatted innumerably — made real by the filtration of impulse. It is an argument for detachment, reattachment, acceptance, and disruption.

So, a self is not bound by a shape, a form, an input, or any singularized output. It is a moment, an event. Reformatting does not remove the material coding from the diachronicity the self has withstood; rather, it reconsiders the overbearing systemic tendency to develop an output, and challenges the procurement of

self that has been historically ensured. In the stead of a self articulated by systemic outputs, we are left with a self within systemic outputs, conversing semiotically with those systems, and therefore embodying change and reclaiming the will to know. Here, the self loses no agency; but, it abstains from the dominances of the systemic bind. Thus, we are calling this type of epistemological systemics an anarchy. Therein, the self is both flexibly able to bend outside of its line-of-selves (participating in the flight-of-self) as well as able to disrupt the language embedded into systems by humans that demands certain outputs align with the logistics of a history. In a symbolic era of acceleration, history is merely a passing demographic for the self to acknowledge or use. Under reformatting, the differences and the unifications, the oceans and the parallaxic girl towards it, are all capably real — a realism anarchically equal under the identification and logical accrument of a program.

CONCRETIZATION OF DIFFERENCE

Ultimately, the defense thus far has been two-fold. We have attempted to establish centers (via media) and to reinforce a materiality that aligns with this medial univocity from which self is articulated. Via media attempts to unify sameness and difference, realism and idealism, the ocean and the girl, real acceleration and occurrent acceleration, the flight-of-self and locum-of-self. The necessity of this is bound to the epistemological demand for rationalizing that

which is external to the self: that which subsumes ideation. Ultimately, in order to equalize being, we ascribe the differences of an interior and an exterior to the displacements of self — that difference is suffused into essential objects due to the need for epistemology to maintain an “itself.” In short, the self in need of a self will semiotize systems’ outputs and internalize abstractions to labor in attempted congruence with them. The obvious instability here lies with discourse: retrospection upon the remnant-self is symbolic, thus a system of historical linearity would want the self-at-hand to appear *in media res*. Ultimately, it wants any differential perspective shift to maintain an apperception of its essential object that is being outputted. The self, though always in flight and always in revolt, will develop silent languages that support self with recourses of authenticity. What we are dealing with, then, is a self whose epistemological formatting centralizes upon the need to reify systemic outputs as ownerships of property; or, the self that materializes abstractions as structural folds of use and distinguishability. In short, this is concretism.

We live in a time of massive concretism. Our efforts to construct ourselves as unique, solitary “authentic” entities in difference to the masses is a measure aimed at concretizing an isolated epistemology — an affirmation of lonely ways of knowing, and a construction of self as a rite of passage that creates a sense of agency and control. Let’s reconsider the girl by the coast. Throughout her life, a process of knowing occurs that defines her relationship to the

ocean: it could be a source of consistent inspiration, an economic necessity, a temporal pleasure, a material fact. What might have once been the raw, phenomenal experience of ocean becomes attached to how the girl sees herself: ocean can be party, ocean can be lunch-break, ocean can be seen as a feed photograph, ocean can be funerary tomb. Ultimately, all of these tendencies are related to labor — the labor of sociality, the labor of capital, the labor of research, the labor of relation, the labor of grieving, respectively. The ocean, so important to the girl, once vast and unknown, becomes the source of attachment to how she functions in relation to her labor — it's an object that frames her upbringing. What might have been an open, limitless expanse now contains her life as an acquisitive transaction. She may use the ocean as a referent to attach concretized ideas of self.

Though this is perhaps a pessimistic epistemology, it allows us to arrive at another fundamental consideration of self. Concretizing difference does not develop hierarchical dominances; rather, the staticity of concretism does. In this sense, we are returning once more to the massification of semiotized epistemology. Firstly, we attributed the will to know as a massified language under which self can pronounce affirmations of being. This can include real or occurrent accelerations of epistemology. What matters most is that knowing is derived from either a unified sameness (as with the girl whose exterior ocean is also interiorly oceanic) or a difference (wherein the ocean as use or symbol dissents from

self). Secondly, we attributed the will of systems to output to be a language which is massified as a material universality: one that happens to construct self. The construction of self as a machinic system furthers the confliction of difference: if self is a complex systemic output, materially equalizing even that which epistemologically is and that which is apperceived as not, then difference and sameness unify.

Thus, the massification of a language that regards structural outputting (the production of essential objects, ecosystemics, economic exchange processes, mathematics) as kernelistic reinforces the *via media* of a systemic tendency to operate in binary. Thus, thirdly, we reach a point of departure, or perhaps a point of reclamation. Concretism, a systemic performance of semiotics with laborious action, can truncate difference to attempt unification. However, the language that staticizes that unification furthers difference temporally, and ultimately, metaphysically: the locum-of-self identifies with the remnant past. Thus, we are using concretism as a semiotic device to identity a program that staticizes identity, rather than concretizing identity in order to establish pure difference. The ordering of epistemological language thus reads: produce identity in counterbalance of difference and sameness, autonomize self by being upon output, and equalize being under the concretism of accelerational occurrence: the self outputs itself, in infinite repetition. In this manner, construction becomes tied up within the notion

of value as it provides the self with the means to concretize through participating in the reification process relational to the system's structural language. The process of constructing self is tied to the realization of oppositional, differential tactics by giving signification unique meaning in order to enhance its perceived linguistic and identified value. To concretize is to engage in the divisionary method of limiting the entire signification process by isolating the act of utterance as a sense of epistemological understanding of self, the verge of an ontology.

By concretizing difference (staticity of identity, the ultimate differential proclamation), a loss of language occurs that reduces the capability of self acceleration. Let's say, for instance, that later in life the girl is involved with the ocean on to the degree of its production of her identity (not parallaxic of a once remnant sameness). For example, consider her the CEO of Asahi glass, fiercely competing in 2014's "Glass Warfare" economic rivalry. Her and Asahi have developed "Dragontrail," an alkali-aluminosilicate sheet glass that is known for its hardness and scratch resistance (a Vickers hardness test rating of 595 to 673), qualities that make it perfect to be used for durable touch screens. Her competition is the famous "Gorilla Glass," developed by Corning Incorporated. The two are engaged in a fiery, adversarial conflict to see who makes the cheapest, best product. Yet, the supply of rare earth metals, micro-metals necessary for the production of glass, are dug up in mines in inner Mongolia, China, and Nevada; and, their

stock is being quickly depleted. A Japanese professor of Earth Science at the University of Tokyo was independently hired to research possible sources for more rare metals by Asahi — he found that there could be enormous stores of rare earth metals on the ocean floor sixty miles off the coast of Hawaii. The mining of these metals from the seafloor would put Asahi far ahead in making cheap, quality “Dragontrail”; in fact, the deposits are so huge that it would expand the quantity of known rare earth metals by 1000 percent.

It’s this sort of materialization of the ocean’s epistemological relationship to the girl that is pliable, shifting, yet subject to the concretization by human mental tendency. Asahi sees the need to mine rare earth quantities in order to further materialize hard constructions involving ownership, social representation, and programs of capital emphasizing the autonomy of specific individuals in relation to a massified whole. We are well acquainted to the Marxist critique of such a process; however, the aforementioned anarchy suggests a process of internalizing the pragmatic experience of how this material work reflexively interpolates labor’s relationship to self-ideology. This is a flexible approach to anarchy. By allowing a flexible epistemology, a “soft” construction of self, there can be a demonstration of how labor deconstructs the idea of itself, or, constructs new mental interfaces that will reconstitute relationships between material experience and mind. Whereas the aforementioned

process demonstrates one of the more obvious capital forms of self-identification and branding, we will explore a multitude of epistemological understandings applied in a “hard” manner to human minds. At times this can cause suffering of not only the mind, but materially through the upheaval of thorium and mud into pristine coasts.

Buddhism determined that “hard construction,” described as attachment, was the direct cause of the world’s suffering. In the Lotus Sutra, the parable of “The Burning House” was used to represent a world burning with the fires of old age, sickness and death. While the flexible anarchical practice described herein arrives at seemingly different conclusions than those reached by Siddhartha, and likewise with Marx; their critique of our world’s sufferable condition is just and apt. Likewise, we seek to self-design an epistemology that describes its inherent flexibility. Our aim is to articulate that reformattability through the raw consideration of how the self attaches, by articulating examples of recombination and, ultimately, by describing an acceptance of the plurality of hard construction as a means toward realizing softness.

SOFT DISRUPTION

The self concretizes at any point of subjectification, at any point of its declaration. This occurs when an exchange of a material epistemology is confronted

with systems of reflex, systems of signs, and by nature of these, systems of pure difference. Ultimately, the bio-moment of construction is both affirmed and lost within the exchange of reflexive signification. The reflexive signification of a previous occurrence is carried forth via apperception of the bio-moments; reflexive signification is a bio-moment itself, and therefore, it is an entirely new locum with the inherited responsibility for its common descent of selves. In this sense, the self, as real, is a non-vitalist manifestation that softly performs that which it is composed of upon any utterance; virtual tendencies programmed in the epistemology (and the materialities influencing that utterance) are performed by degree, or, abstract ratios of sensory input operating across axes towards action. Although the performative identity has developed the language to preempt the storing faculties of essential objects, the delayed expression of self as itself is merely a post-performance of a bio-self by preliminary language's account. It is only read as bio- when the language develops an accelerated position. Both are clearly material maneuvers; but, we are to read them as differential because the language for them is differential. By this, it is meant that an expression of self is fundamental to epistemology, and therefore, it is materially inherent in the production of identity. Further, the self, which is already articulated upon a socio-strata (or eco-strata), is expressed by nature of a material realness. Therefore, hypostasis is already present. Surplus as a subterranean object is ultimately always at hand. In other words, difference is real in

the form of sameness, and vice versa. Concretism is then deceptively productive if the acceleration is affective without its inherent construction.

Put simply, the moment of self becomes itself (both homomorphically and heteromorphically, for all epistemologies) continuously, which allows for construction to be attached to and detached from its structure infinitely. What we are wanting to draw attention to is a language of self that is challenging its own surplus, biogenesically developing a center (via media) that neither demands relation as a source of identity, nor produces identity from an essential kernel. This softness of construction is pliable in its materiality (that the self is formed by a systemic outputting), as well as in its preliminary semiosis which detects its common descent (and aberrantly purported herein) in its language for acceleration. This movement-based access to epistemological structures are of use; they contain sameness and share difference in that they are systemically outputting specificities of particularization. In short, accelerated epistemology is a flight-of-self that feels responsible for a surplus and ethically reformats that which preliminarily semiotizes its static (essential) object of being.

Reformatting is used here as an account of acceleration upon performance. If that which is already articulated is self, then a flight-from-self (semiotically) is to reformat that which concretizes statically back upon a historical line of “self.” In this

sense, the self is glissile in a fundamentally positive way. Identity, experience, ontology, etc. are defined upon a materialized bio-moment. The socio-strata of selves is always occurring and therefore the stagnation that stems from fear of relational models is lost within the reference of acceleration. To suggest reformatting is not to assume that there is a removal of the desire towards a relational labor inherent to the hard construction of self. An epistemological desire for an itself is still highly relevant to an acceleration of the soft concretism that is in enactment. Let's confront this by attributing the self to its ritornello — a “little return” of theme. This describes a capacity for return, a dynamics used to articulate growth between preliminarily semiotic samenesses, and a sensation of change as cumulative surmounting. With this, there may be the assumption that return is annular, though instead we are using it in its motific sense of arranging a reference that was, or is, systemically similar: even kindred. Considering the aforementioned systemic bind under a hope for outputting, it only makes sense that a moment in which a self was particularized will be subjected to replica (hardened concretism). This “at any point of subejectification” refers to a delicate moment in which the self 1. generates a systemic output, 2. relates that output to another temporal system which was particularly arranged, and 3. semiotically carries forth a continuance of that general arrangement in moments when the semiotic system's abstraction is read as real. In short, the soft construction of a self (as it was) concretizes an isolated arrangement of

systems once tense and hardened within an output. Further, there is no absolutizing of the subject. Once the semiotization occurs about a bio-moment, the new relation creates an entirely new object. The ritornello, then, is the immanent centralization of surplus. Although there is an intentionality which recalls arrangement, the object which is occurrent (in realistic finitude) is deeper than the reference made (theory and praxis).

Ultimately, reformatting is not an act of removal or obstruction, but rather a disruption of a concretic tendency to associate the return as either purely same or to consider a locum as purely differential. Reformatting does not prevent these associations from being made; instead, it ensures that the acceleration of relational multiplicity is dynamic, that there is developmental difference within a sameness. Disruption of staticity — towards a lifting of epistemological attachments — are machinic procedures directed at the functionalities of any idealism which proliferates immobility. Much like a nation depends on its own commission of rebuilding roads and bridges to stimulate economy, the soft construction of self systemizes procedures that are materially logical. Disruption can then be thought of in multiple ways. For example, disruption can be the confronting of a these rebuilders to ascertain their position on the situation: whether they are laboring the same labor that was performed on the bridge being built over, whether the rebuilt bridge is the built over bridge, or whether both bridges are

of sameness but their collective surplus is already semiotically implied upon its existence as being. Disruption then must be analyzed as a two-fold object: it is the material itself and the exchange by which the system's output differentially reads the reformatting. By this, it is meant that the self as an assemblage of tense systemic outputs will semiotically go through a paraphrastic rendition of that tension in order to affirm flight. Difference is then imploded and sameness is machinically through-composing the entire pantheon of notional returns. We hold that this soft disruption bisects an ethical flexibility, one that temporally engages with the providences of material movement, and the epistemologies that are able to be sustained intermittently.

It would be a shame for there to be a philosophical import in an epistemology which assures a definition of sameness as being a concretized self that is always same. This would demand a philosophy which ignores both the micro-politics of particle covalence, as well as the macro-politics (or surface essences) of blank subjectification. In other words, the self is always in articulation but is, for the most part, not actively being declared. However, in current socio-programs, the point of participation is the leveling of this reality. The self declares blankness in order to justify a line of sameness. To disrupt this program is to reformat the user-profile — to propagate pluralities, or even misunderstanding, upon the preliminary semiotics via which the program functions. In this, capitalism struggles

to find the itself, programs struggle to capitalize from individual autonomy to flight, etc. Sameness is a soft construction: it nominalizes the process, the movement, and the event of materialism, but initializes objects that are differential in their macro-politics. For the girl and the sea, there is difference at one degree of the surplus, but the relation forms objects. The once held unification she felt is now semiotic surplus to which her ritornello will recall. Accelerating the alteration between knowing self and declaring self is not necessarily the acceleration professed herein. Rather, we are looking at a self who's ritornello arrives in the flesh: an anarchical declaration of an already articulated being.

ANARCHO-FLEXION

Our appropriative use of the political term “anarchy” can be seen as a reclamation of terminology. For one, our political climate, defined by existent hegemonic political structures, has forced contemporary anarchy to place itself in the negative: the State is seen as undesirable, unnecessary, or harmful. Out of necessity, and in resistance to a status quo, it is a political philosophy that is often defined by its opposition. At its loosest, and as we argue at its best, anarchical thought can simply be applied positively as an orientation that promotes non-hierarchical organization, specifically the free association of individuals — or as we are arguing here, self constructions.

The manner in which we desire to apply anarchy is by reclaiming it as not being defined by what it's against. Despite the shortcomings of our current political status quo, our object (labor) exists within its signified parameters, conditions that heavily affect, yet don't necessarily change the object of labor in and for itself (by material and biological necessity). Thus, to change the nature of our labor, as we have mentioned previously, is to change the very fundamental peripherals of our experience. When applying the free association of possible constructions to the act of reformatting an epistemological influence — to not view them as static concretism — is to begin to consider their modularity. Easier said than done. It can begin with a critique of the singular, the critique of difference — the primary device that allows hierarchy in terms of constructing the individuality of self-conception. When we view ourselves as detached from the singular idea of a constructed self, the flexible, anarchical mood begins to see self as horizontal in its arrangement. Its advocacy aligns with the creation, development, and ultimate maintenance of the self as an equitable distribution of consideration — reformatting its will to identity, to social representation, to ownership, to sociological demography — an act that may concern some, rightfully, as expropriatively robbing it of individual agency or liberty.

The anarchical process of reformatting the constructed self is not seen as the explicit effort to remove the will to identity — it's not to alienate

one's heritage, history, or claim to difference as a means of oppressing individual liberty. Rather, its emphasis rests on the material interchangeability of constructing the self; that we own property; that we don't own property; that we engage in certain rituals that matriculate from desire; that our processes and social methodologies are acts of labor; that our labor is designable and reformattable. It's this effort to flexibly equalize, to radicalize, to program that forms the crux of a Flexible Anarchy — an option where pliancy can always inform the concrete, the organic description of the self detached from the hard fixation of belief, and the emphasis of sustainable growth that is synonymous with perpetual revolution.

Anarchy, then, must break from its significant role with nihilism. Rather, disruption and deconstruction can be tied to the acts of making the harshly loud become soft in its orientation, a return to leaderless direction that emphasizes discoverable conditional, contingent asystems. In this way, the anarchical description of social ecology finds cadence with accelerated reformattable epistemologies, the analysis of self construction as an inherently communitarian enterprise. The moral economy that's established through flexibly approaching self-construction remarks heavily against kyriarchical attachment, the sort of language that alienates freely associated selves into fixed entities. In terms of self-governance, the appeal to a higher authority in fixing the self to a certain constructive combination remains an affirmative activity; yet, its recombination suggests

only further affirmation. To reformat that initial combinative framework is to isocratically expand into anarchic fluidity — the detached formulation of these freely associated impressions allows conversation to take place. It isn't the interaction between potentialities that accounts for a horizontal placement — it's an acceptance of the surplus pragmatic impressionary data that is otherwise shut off from the concretized construct. In this manner, any object understood or created by another becomes an extension of any given self due to the epistemological potentiality that particular understanding/object may contain; it's limitless in it's possible relationships and "appears" as a convergence between it's "sameness," it's knowable substantiality, and it's unique difference that proclaims it as an accelerated agent — containing particular energy. The footwork occurs by realizing equalization through the programming of labor that allows for this anarchical, epistemic acceleration (ultimately a radicalization) that is quietized in it's relation to totality.

a methodology for study

filtration:

Our method has involved attempting to present an experimental exhibition (and exposition) of the manner in which epistemological parameters (material, social, systemic, relational, etc.) influence the construction of self. We have designed nine filters that ultimately serve to summarize self construction — a decision that emphasizes flexibility, pliancy, and spectral diversity regarding the differential placement of self, as well as their similarity. The attempt in “filtering” is to affirm difference, emphasizing semiotic differentiation via language, etc. while simultaneously highlighting the totalistic interchangeability of self by recognizing their original, procedural formatting. The inevitable reformattability that speaks through their coexistence demonstrates potential epistemological expansion, acceleration, and ultimate totalistic acceptance toward a non-denominational, non-dominant relationality.

Admittedly, the filters were arrived at dialectically. We isolated their influence on epistemology by viewing each as independently determinant. Their significance and agency came by analyzing how the self abstracts itself and how it embodies itself materially. That is to say, all nine are an attempt to structurally articulate “epistemological trends” regarding construction. The filters are present when one articulates the self upon any action. There are varying degrees of abstract and material exchange occurring via these filters;

and, one steps into them — almost horoscopically — depending on how one articulates self and orients it into how one knows and thinks, an epistemology. Each filter exists as a material system, embodied through articulation, that contains varying levels of abstraction arrived at through the act of speaking that system of construction. They are languages to be used and massified in their use, a demonstration of an acceleration towards forwarding constructed epistemology. The independent languages can ultimately be rearranged and recombined innumerable; however each contains its own lexicon, its own ecosystem and method for defining, building, and extending the self.

filters:

1. Representation of Social

Perhaps more than any other filter, the self's "representation [as] social" is definitively tied to language. The adherence of systemic value is found in the means of representation within community, a relational definition of self in regards to speaking social language. The self is found in the anchoring point, a moment of utterance, a moment of value, within the flux of signifiers that are temporally and epistemologically known through language, or any abstract process of relationally "speaking." To represent socially is to engage in participatory, spoken languages where meaning is found in densified, massified culture. The self is found in flexion or in praxis with the flux of signification occurring, and

is defined as a moving anchor within a relational vocabulary.

2. Ownership of Property

Ownership is tied to acquisition, an epistemological trend located in the transaction of dialectically gaining or acquiring skills, traits, qualities, materials, etc. This can assume a process of economic valuation that ultimately constructs an ownership of individuality — the means are properties that justify the end (self). Any acquisition is assumed to be involved in an epistemological empiricism, a realism, that can suggest elements of environmental or biological determinism regarding what is known. Furthermore, the economic process of acquisitive transaction, the act of owning, in regards to epistemology define an inherently “free-market” polity of self that attempts to be self-regulated in liberty. Ownership defines the limits to human knowledge; and, the rational nature of self-interest constructs the idea of self in relation to material, demonstrable, observable properties.

3. Production of Identity

In regards to essentiality for the self as a declarative construction that is fixed within specific parameters, or as a description of fluidity therein. This can be described in relation to social ontology within the traditional liberal political framework, where the self is conceptualized in terms of individual citizenry; as such, it can be defined in terms of the “original

position” where identity is conceptually divested of all specific affiliation to make rationality possible. From this hollow point, further associative affiliation (or group representation) can form an evolutionary growth of identity where particularity and plurality aggregate to form systematic goals, interests, and ultimately, constructive ideas of self. The structural marginalization that takes place in late capitalism, in regards to identity, provokes an understanding of identity as it applies to individual social location, history, experience, oppression, mobility, assimilation, collectivity, or conceptual individuality. Such, “production” of identity demarcates the recognition and application of identity, pluralistically and centrally; and, it forms a central self-reflexive continuum of literal “identification” regarding epistemology and self construction, forming the “raw material” for both concretism or flexibility.

4. Capitalization of Autonomy

Our use of autonomy involves the simple idea of self-governance. This is personal authority and agency applied to the construction of self — that one is actually able to act as an independent self, initiating action, designing action, designing labor, and ultimately committing to the format and reformat of an epistemological process. The capitalization of that autonomy involves the concretic, affirmative process of emphasizing, commodifying, or utilizing the idea or practice of autonomy as a means of fixing an epistemological understanding of self.

5. Detachment of Ownership

The sublimation of the acquisitive ownership of properties into a dissociative epistemological position between the self and those properties. This can involve the opening of localized coherence into epistemologically trusting a global incoherence. Such, detaching from localized understanding of material, empirical, observable known acquisition, and even economics in total, can result in a means toward transformative self-recontextualization, or, at the very least (to keep the realist picture intact) a recontextualization that occurs as a result of changing the epistemological relationship between a concretized self as it relates to material property.

6. Identification of Program

The process of recognizing phenomenal action, language, or structure as affirmatively in relation to self, and the dispatchment of this program through representation, recognition, mimesis, activity, etc. Identification can be committed or transitory — our use of the term involves the procedural nature of developing a location for the determinant program. This can involve furthering any of the other filters used, or, finding a systematic approach that eventually leads to further output. It's a mediation of the self in finding a program to concretize within, the self becomes constructed through the use and the representational act of engaging, speaking, or affirming the identified program.

7. Movement of Radicalization

The means to arrive at soft disruption through radical re-contextualization in response to viewing an epistemological monism. Such, the construction of self becomes totalistic through the radical movement of accepting ambiguity of identity for all finite and conditional sources. Radicalization could imply an existentialism by offering repudiation of structural guides that seek to unify constructive efforts. At its most expansive, the movement is to unvoice the self in order to describe a translucent and immanent epistemological position that evolves through consistent deconstruction and construction. In this way, self-recontextualization expresses an act of overcoming difference that can be viewed dialectically, albeit detached from any Hegelian or Marxist ideas of teleological progression, or historical hierarchy. Instead, the “radical” is obtained in the means of consistently undermining the chosen object to give rise to fluid progression. It’s a means to unvoice the “moment of utterance” to instill a further value through the radical.

8. Equalization of Being

The sublimation of self into equilibrium with itself as a concretized, fixed agent or an equilibrium that is arrived at through transient fluidity. Any sort of equalization regarding self construction takes place as an absolute mediation, or absolute dialectic, perhaps a negation, towards it’s finity as it pertains to any need re-address an epistemological difference or attachment. This can involve a topological,

phenomenological, or existential approach to reading how the self is subsumed into equalization — be it through action, language, thought, etc. Yet, we argue it's primary attributive orientation (for the sake of this defense) is towards a self-negation that leads to rarified acceptance, or detachment, that allows for further pathways into acceleration or reformatting.

9. Programming of Labor

The systematic outputting of specification, implementation, semantics, correctness, abstraction, or computation into a labor setting that is consistently applied to imply an innovation or extension. The knowledge of labor's programmability allows for the the unknowability of potential, limitless (alterable) (reformattable) labor structures to be fashioned and re-arranged — opening up epistemology inherently through programming's alterable design. The self is thus attached to the program of a labor methodology, detaching it from any ideology or concretic form outside the experience of modification and action. When detached from systems of representation, the programming of labor changes the very nature of the constructive self — as the changeability of the self's peripheral experience is fundamentally applicative in labor.

procedure:

The nine filters are combinative in how they relate to each other. Their association complicates the

implications each individually contain. This results in a constant reformative interplay through their association. Each filter can modify one another to create an entire continuum of interaction regarding their potential epistemological exchange. Our study's design involves the organization of nine filters into 36 groupings (or bi-conjectures) that associate two filters as an epistemological "theme." Their grouping sketches an associative progression regarding how the two define a method for construction, an orientative style regarding epistemology and self. These thirty six themes are then studied in terms of their modification with a third filter; we do this seven times within each of the 36 bi-conjectures, amounting to a total of 252 modifications, or, 3 renderings of 84 possible combinations within an independent grouping of three filters. For the purpose of the study, we felt that restricting the combination to groups of three highlighted the filters interchangeable nature, while also simultaneously allowing a total that exhibited breadth without being exhaustive: a "mean" of efficiency regarding the experiment.

The method of filtering self construction allowed for us to consider how a moving object (self) places parameters on what it signifies. These parameters paradigmatically form boundaries the sign must exist within to represent the object. Like we've described in the defense, the construction of self places parameters on the signs that construct experience and how experience is epistemologically known. Undoubtedly, to laboriously attempt a

reformatting, to epistemologically accelerate, changes the parameters of the sign such that there is flexibility in the self's construction. The study that follows is a series of 36 bi-conjectures, or more specifically 252 modifications. Our method for approaching each "experiment" was to essentially describe their combinative relationship as a logic, to consider how a binary coupling would theoretically interact with a third modification and to analyze their relationship in a manner theoretically specific to our defense and totalistically within larger discourse. We sought to apply applicative examples that visualize each triad taking place inductively. Overall, this methodology seeks to open the perspective outlook regarding a fixed epistemology by non-statically looking at how these filters construct. We attempted to demonstrate an epistemological ecosystem with the methods of construction applying interchangeably, fluidly, and flexibility. This avoids staticity regarding the construction of self, and highlights the possibility for temporal diversity regarding bio-moments, a moment where epistemology fixates flexibly, only to rearrange as another thematic application. Our 252 varying formats demonstrate the coexistent, real acceleration occurring as a universal condition that can be understood as a flexible, possible, anarchical epistemological totality.

formulae:

The benefits of these nine filters unfold themselves in the undulating possibilities of their conjecture

upon combination. Before expositing combinational constructions in the study which follows (their benefits, occluded relationships within the folds, assurance of topographical finitude, etc.), let us exhaust the formulas that logically compound our experiment. The formulae are to inhibit multiplex outcome; to assert that a singular outcome is officially applicable is to remove a system from its reticulation of interconenctive, recombinative non-origin.

Instead, we identify projections of bio-moments: how they were, and how they were positioned as useful. This is an excavation of macro-politics: a deciphering of surface relations. Hopefully, though, these projections could be analyzed further by others, filtering exponentially towards more concentrated studies of construction.

Combining two filters to form a theme of flexible anarchy helps to reformat a tendency towards singularizing a combination. In the 252 combinations, each triad will be analyzed three times with three themes embedded in each. In this sense, we have:

$$[(n) \text{ filters} - (r) \text{ conjectures} = (y) \text{ modifiers per theme}] * \\ [((n \text{ filters within set})! / ((n - r)! * (r)!)) = (z) \text{ conjectural} \\ \text{combinations}] = (x) \text{ number of modified constructions}$$

$$[9 \text{ filters} - 2 \text{ bi-conjectures} = 7 \text{ modifiers per theme}] \\ * [((9 \text{ filters } (n) \text{ within set})! / ((n - \text{number of filters} \\ \text{in each combination } (r)! * (r)!)) = 36 \text{ bi-conjectural} \\ \text{combinations}] = 252 \text{ modified constructions}$$

Then we consider the 252 modified constructions one step further, aligning the triads with similar sets (as if r was 3), dividing 252 by 3, giving us 84 triadic constructions with three perspectives of modification and theme. It is important, we think, to develop this array without permutation in order to remove dominance for any analytic system; the multiplex should be repetitiously infinite.

a study in accelerated epistemological reformatting

36 BI-CONJECTURES

accumulation
development
acquisition
transference
discourse
adaptation
uniformity
comprehension
reification
authority
opposition
optimization
resistance
authorization
systemization
affirmation
disassociation
intentionality
reform
neutralization
substantiation
access
justification
amplification
justice
regulation
discipline
exodus
nothingness
conception
precision
categorization
reason
accelerated reformatting
anarchy
flexibility

ACCUMULATION

representation of social + ownership of property

Representation implies a linear signification that when publicly exchanged causes a push-pull in need of constitutable reification. This is typically rearranged in the form of ownership. The reiform of the sign (the backgrounds of historical languages, the behavioralist mistakes of valuation, the sublimation aside any sign, etc.) must engage (if it is being used) in the overturning of social fluctuation, causing properties of that form to become destabilized. In another sense, though what one owns is reflected in who they are, the sign is not strong enough to support concepts of ownership simultaneously with social self-consumption: the reticular sign is both multitudinous and fleeting. Considering ownerships as forms of langrangian fixation will ultimately cause unsure extensions when attempting to identify or even autonomize. In the barest form of this bi-conjecture, there

is a procedural machinization that takes free forms, gathers them into conceptual semiosis, and displays them as an original arrangement of substance: accumulation. Amassing objects that have retransforms of social capital alienates the being from that accumulation; though, this does not acquit them from the consideration of growth as a cumulative process. Rather, the privatization of matter is an all-encompassing maneuver, and if transvaluation challenges the legitimacy of it socially, the sign is lost, subsumed by an ownership whose only accumulative order is univocal. Accumulation of sign on the other hand is an advantageous prospect that does not predicate a dialectical collapse; but, instead, it causes a manipulation of ownership (much like the the fluctuations of strata) allowing for rearrangement of epistemological ownership over experience, preparing it for the alteration of states: accumulation as progressive preemption.

MODIFYING ACCUMULATION

representation of social + ownership of property

+

production of identity =
user identity

+

capitalization of autonomy =
human capital

+

detachment of ownership =
negligence

+

identification of program =
valorization

+

movement of radicalization =
empire

+

equalization of being =
reciprocity

+

programming of labor =
pension

DEVELOPMENT

representation of social + production of identity

The epistemological act of sign exchange (as a socially determined phenomena) is inherently attached to initial impulses to fix, expand, and produce identity: they both perpetually inform one another within self-construction, simultaneously, in the form of development. The occurrent process of “knowing” begins in development as a language (any language). Language is enhanced and grown into fascinating forms through new self-identification. The act of speaking often becomes synonymous with self construction and even self-knowledge; their interchangeability forms the basis of the “raw material” regarding the essential dimension of reflexive, a posteriori, psychological self-identification — development. In this sense, development becomes the key element to association. It clarifies underlying associative matching. Development is reflexively applied through the combination of ambient

and active signs. Through development, the initial existence of assimilation and independence are formed. Social, semiotic code is fundamentally applied to uniqueness, or independence; or, it is formulated constructively to contain an “original position” regarding identification be it through gender, history, heritage, location, etc. Eventually, the code can be seen as rearrangeable. Identification begins to filter and use the semiotic code for its own purposes. In this manner, the development process becomes the specific use of language and signs to reaffirm a concretized construction of self; or rather, identification opens up language to suggest continuum, plurality, or fluid location. This way, identification can swiftly move through the semiotic structure.

MODIFYING DEVELOPMENT

representation of social + production of identity

+

ownership of property =
solidification

+

capitalization of autonomy =
self-actualization

+

detachment of ownership =
Sartrean abandonment

+

identification of program =
analysand

+

movement of radicalization =
trans-formation

+

equalization of being =
performativity

+

programming of labor =
problemetization

ACQUISITION

representation of social + capitalization of autonomy

Agency, regarding semiosis or any formulated language, is the autonomous ability to use code both outwardly and inwardly. Acquisition becomes the moment when language is acquired, gained, or apprehended by the self as a fully manipulatable tool to freely affirm experience and self. Its mastery can be applied in the exterior as a frame that changes the fundamental treatment or manipulation of material. The acquiring process can take place when a pre-existing semiotic structure is independently “taken up” as an initiating action. It is the self’s agency within and commitment to said language that causes that language to outwardly acquire peripherals of reality as it relates to that operative freedom the self is acting upon. Alternatively, autonomy itself can be “spoken about” as a representation. The self’s perceived sense of agency can be described and signified through representative forms

and movements. At its most flexible, acquisition takes place within the process of using agency and semiosis to reflex internally. It is the suggestion of freely looking inward to examine the code that is being utilized. The self-critical manipulation of semiotics is a key element of agency. The constructed self becomes a reformattable entity, its own progression is a free-agent that acquires internal critique and progressivity.

MODIFYING ACQUISITION

representation of social + capitalization of autonomy

+

ownership of property =
actuality

+

production of identity =
latent-tendency

+

detachment of ownership =
psychosis

+

identification of program =
reflexion

+

movement of radicalization =
detrterritorialization

+

equalization of being =
contentment

+

programming of labor =
survivalism

TRANSCERENCE

representation of social + detachment of ownership

A removal of localized significance is both the massification of concept and the irreversibility of temporal occurrence.

Deregulating the narrowifications of a use-value ultimately allows for the intercommunication of surplus; within an object, the possible systemic outputting could align with epistemological representation of the object itself. This would mean to consider barriers as less of a lack of operative, and more of a mode of articulation. In regards to the local, assuming the intransigence of an action as merely a spike in the resonant program would be to misinterpret the range of perspective tendencies. This can both be applied to the psycho-systemics that a human tangles and untangles in repetition, the identity movement across definitions, and even the spatiotemporal backdrop under which an object is in at a given movement. Detachment from the sign, as well as signifying from a place of

detachment, ensures a level of detail that otherwise submits to attention — one of ownership. To detach, in this sense, is to gain access to exposed rifts in the coding of experiences. For example, the object-human in transference is furthered by paradox in that detaching from two objects' (each singular interfacing) removes the contradiction as the replacement of an expression of new systemization. The identity would then be in a conversation between form, restriction, and infinity, thus allowing for alternation of the outermost combination, not bound by the conforms of selfhood.

MODIFYING TRANSFERENCE

representation of social + detachment of ownership

+
ownership of property =
phenomenology

+
production of identity =
schizophrenia

+
detachment of ownership =
colonization

+
identification of program =
counterculture

+
movement of radicalization =
socio-nomadism

+
equalization of being =
affect

+
programming of labor =
transversality

DISCOURSE

representation of social + identification of program

Demonstrative signs are superimpositions of reference, yes, but they are figurative realities unto themselves. To exhibit a reference in sequence demands discursive reduction or else the program runs without demarcation. Attempting to regularize a discursive action is a form of practice, working through the reduction in order to explicate productive discourse. This balance of articulation and praxis generates both nouveau and banal motions of sign systems that are in transit towards agreement. Stated alternatively, discourse can both stagnate the move towards understanding; it has the potential to rationalize the string in a connective manner. This depends on a system-to-system exchange, wherein the projection by one pole is introjected by the other if and only if the space for covalence is provided. Thus, we are identifying multiple programs upon the acquiescence of sign transfer, though the

inputting may be undesired. Firstly, we are noting that there is a density to the sign, to the manner in which the sign is promoted, and to the environment in which the sign was uttered. Reading this code is to both consider stagnant concepts of intelligence and intuition: the density is gathered differently based on the system of exchange. The second program to identity is that of the systems which are at play beyond the sign: the object which is receiving it, the manner in which reception has been expressed, and ultimately, the potential localization of that introjection as a relational tool.

MODIFYING DISCOURSE

representation of social + identification of program

+

ownership of property =
intellectual property

+

production of identity =
visibility

+

capitalization of autonomy =
discursive practice

+

detachment of ownership =
repressive desublimation

+

movement of radicalization =
mass communication

+

equalization of being =
interdiscursivity

+

programming of labor =
deconstruction

ADAPTATION

representation of social + movement of radicalization

The radicalized form of coded language is one that is literally, fundamentally descriptive in its valuative process. It is the descriptive exchange of the sign and the signified. The language becomes accelerated, or extreme, in its proclivity to represent and describe. Such, the system of language is self-contained as a force with the capability to adapt to, or force, an adaptation of whatever it is representing. The code itself is soft in its ability to adapt freely within new systems, settings, environments, or even new use-forms. Its pliancy reflects the fully disclosed nature of the radicalized language, a feature that ultimately equalizes the language as a self-contained, self-maintaining system of code. Given its strength, its forcefulness, its robustness regarding an ability to describe, the language can also “force” independent signs into its semiotic orbit. In this way, the power of adaptation becomes contingent upon 1. the language’s own descriptive

development, and 2. the language's ability to rouse or include other isolated variables. The act of adaptation is inherently flexible in its use; however, it's also a consistent tool for concretization or even oppression. The self-contained language can be used to propagandize its particular mode of signification as unique and universally applicable. The language is a statement of ultimate difference; yet, its propagation seeks ultimate representational similarity. Adaptation's primary power lies in the inherently manipulatable manner of semiotics. Its radicalized use as a perceived all-encompassing code has consistent application towards self-construction becoming eternally self-descriptive. Adaptation reformats the self into new versions of itself, as a means to bring objects into unique or already existing descriptive vocabularies.

MODIFYING ADAPTATION

representation of social + movement of radicalization

+
ownership of property =
the culture industry

+
production of identity =
liminality

+
capitalization of autonomy =
biopower

+
detachment of ownership =
contingency

+
identification of program =
praxis

+
equalization of being =
autopoiesis

+
programming of labor =
social movement

UNIFORMITY

representation of social + detachment of ownership

In order to fully embody linear signification, there must be a normalization of the necessity for doing so. The need for signification is expressed in the discursive properties of being and their implicit transference (dislocation), but only once the act of producing sign is atop the deconstruction and hard construction of meaning will the actualization of its expression be totalized. In other words, the uniformity of sign is not the compactification of conveyance across any semiotic spectrum, but the output mechanization as an articulation of meaning. To assume that language is an equalizer (in its lack of enunciation) is to ignore the reality that neither the sign nor the signified are stable; thus, uniformity expresses the necessity of performativity, and less the inspection of bilateral consequence. However, on the other hand of this dissent, the programs

in place do and should take offense to the bilateralizations of semiotic arrays when applied to discourse, or even display performance of the being within strata (social, psychological, political, axiological). In this sense, uniformity does not uproot the offense, but merely constructs the assemblage which constitutes alliance. This is, again, not to say that ignorance is paid unto problem, but rather that accelerated languages of reformatting beings take signs with stride, for the entirety of discovery is implicated already in the gesture of its conference.

MODIFYING UNIFORMITY

representation of social + equalization of being

+
ownership of property =
sense of place

+
production of identity =
third space theory

+
capitalization of autonomy =
unionization

+
detachment of ownership =
public sphere

+
identification of program =
labor power

+
movement of radicalization =
liquid modernity

+
programming of labor =
workforce

COMPREHENSION

representation of social + programming of labor

Programming sign exchange into a labor structure extends the language system into the act of work. Linguistic laboring becomes an inherently alterable design scheme due to labor's applicative nature. Comprehension involves a methodology of sign application; it's the inherent ability to fully, totalistically understand the interaction occurring within signification. The sign and the signifier are observed and comprehended due to the self's ability to reflexively understand the nature of its relationship to labor. In this sense, it's an ideology that becomes secondary due to the material component of the labor program. Albeit, if said program is attached to ideology, the comprehension becomes adapted to the implicit bias within the work structure. Yet, the flexibility exists within the potentiality of diversely applied work. The self's epistemological ability to comprehend the

“other,” or, to comprehend the external semiotic vocabulary taking place, is essential to the devices employed in the language. Such, the reinterpretation of the labor allows for renewed programmability of the language as it exists materially in the act of producing programs. The language itself can dictate the program. The program’s ability to formulate the signification process allows for concurrent understandings to take place through accelerated epistemological relationships with differing labor structures.

MODIFYING COMPREHENSION

representation of social + equalization of being

+
ownership of property =
bare life

+
production of identity =
alterity

+
capitalization of autonomy =
stream of consciousness

+
detachment of ownership =
aphasia

+
identification of program =
dialogism

+
equalization of being =
catharsis

+
programming of labor =
rhizome

REIFICATION

ownership of property + production of identity

The notion of morphology has less to do with the exchanges of what one might be inclined to call a closed system (what we would call a densified system) and more to do with the type of object that is formed upon a conceptual impact — the network of an object as its shape. Reification is to be thought of as a materialization of an abstraction. In our bi-conjecture, both identity and ownership deal with abstractions that materialize; they are systems of output. The catalysis of an abstraction-to-materialization exchange is centered, caused by the two concepts of production and property. Production is a thru-putted continuum that when affixed by the reifications of identity and ownership — points along the cresting — connects them to the flighting pathways that are ultimately interior to a system. Thus, identity and ownership become intertwined in a Janusian manner, engaging in exchanges beyond that of

single-point causality. A densified system exchanging itself, from abstract-to-material, does so in the heteromorphic sense: an abstract gains further reification when connected to production machines, and materials expand more densely upon the reification of a total systemic abstraction. This conjecture of a multiplicity is, despite synchronic register, unstable; thus, the notions of property must distill under the continuous filtration of its surrounding programs.

MODIFYING REIFICATION

ownership of property + production of identity

+
representation of social =
commodity fetishism

+
capitalization of autonomy =
concretism

+
detachment of ownership =
Brecht's estrangement

+
identification of program =
cathexis

+
movement of radicalization =
panpsychism

+
equalization of being =
staticity

+
programming of labor =
The Garden of Forking Paths

AUTHORITY

ownership of property + capitalization of autonomy

The ownership of property can be interpreted as a material constant, or asset, within the act of capitalizing on autonomy. Here, possession implies material authority, a physical difference, which is ultimately epistemologically applied to construct self in regards to that difference. A perceived authority takes place through the embodied demographics related to ownership. Agency can be related to environmental, biological, or economic factors which are capitalized upon to reach further autonomy. In this way, ideology is received through the tacit epistemological bias contained within the property that is owned. Authority is derived through this raw difference, the difference in possession and the arbitrariness that emanate from freely acting within the constructed self-hoods rooted in that ownership. To flexibly consider this is to reverse the dichotomy by allowing a possession of agency to flow into ownership. In this

way, autonomy is assumed to be existent. Ownership occurs through liberty — a liberality that is flexible enough to allow for a linear, flexible self construction through obtaining qualities, traits, or knowledge. Such, authority can lead to transparency, the opening of property through lucid freedom not explicitly tied to self-interest, but through institutional empowerment.

MODIFYING AUTHORITY

ownership of property + capitalization of autonomy

+

representation of social =
cultural arbitration

+

production of identity =
interpellation

+

detachment of ownership =
decolonization

+

identification of program =
hypervigilance

+

movement of radicalization =
simulacra

+

equalization of being =
panopticon

+

programming of labor =
superstructure

OPPOSITION

ownership of property + detachment of ownership

Opposition refers to the inherent tension between ownership and detachment as a co-creative energy that is by nature, disruptive. Tension affects any object attached to particular conscious experience by describing its uniqueness as not related to a specific epistemological position. Moreover, the inherent removal of a conception of self from property demonstrates the inclusionary tactic of literally opening the localized coherence of any given property or material. In this way, the material becomes liquidated and diffused — a disruption used to sublimate the object from status, acquisition, meaning, value; or, differently, it is the mere recontextualization of that property into a shared collectivity or even chaotic status. The global incoherence of this tension can be materially evident in the actual liberation of objects from personal ownership. Specifically, within self construction, the epistemological

relationship to the object can become recontextualized since it is not ideologically attached to an idea of self. The reformatting of the object, or property, provokes mind to consider the object in perpetual flux, and, as a result, the mind as in continuum, in opposition to fixation, or a concretization that may occur through attachment to properties. Opposition becomes the absence of staticity, the absence of agglutinative viscosity regarding capitalized objects — it is to oppose the epistemological attachment to determined dialectics, acquisitions, materials, qualities, or value.

MODIFYING OPPOSITION

ownership of property + detachment of ownership

+

representation of social =
qualisignification

+

production of identity =
social stratification

+

capitalization of autonomy =
ego-ideal

+

identification of program =
intertextuality

+

movement of radicalization =
exceptionalism

+

equalization of being =
chaos

+

programming of labor =
disruption

OPTIMIZATION

ownership of property + identification of program

The potentiality of an object is already embedded within, and connected to, the lines which are directed at any exo-function. To proclaim the use of something (be it an object, a system, a machine, a structure) is to synecdochally state the obvious, for the sign of use is already articulated in the design. Thus, there are two modes for optimizing the use of an objet: to publicly propertize or to remove its syntax. This means that to optimize that which is abstractly owned and whose functionality reads like a language pragmaticizes the object to the restriction of form. Optimization is a post-historical decryption of use: the transvaluation of how to carry forth as a non-dialectic, non-representable force. Publicly propertizing means to multiply the systems of exo-functional relationships. The psychology of ownership is one embedded with territory, and thus, the constraints of semiotic possession latently pulls back

the momentum to process use. To remove syntax is to strip the use mechanism altogether; identifying a program of that which is possessed as a non-structural process demands open cadence. Here, ownership implies the one attempting to activate use, the program being the reticular sidestepping by which use is performed, not held. Optimization is, by this fact, a spatiotemporal move towards change, in that the use must be activated atop further deciphers of programs in motion — the change occurs when the two moving components optimize, or perform multiplex work throughout their surplus.

MODIFYING OPTIMIZATION

ownership of property + identification of program

+

representation of social =
nominalism

+

production of identity =
spectacle

+

capitalization of autonomy =
drive

+

detachment of ownership =
futurism

+

movement of radicalization =
détournement

+

equalization of being =
diachronic

+

programming of labor =
synchronic

RESISTANCE

ownership of property + movement of radicalization

Resistance is the preservation of material, or change, compiled to combat against the onset of oppression. Owning property through acquisition or transaction ultimately materializes in the will to preserve or conserve the method of ownership. “Anti-establishment” considers the radicalization of ownership against the alienating onset of restraining mechanisms from outside institutions, or literal establishments. Resistance can mean the active will to preserve ideas of ownership — be it ownership of rights or considerations of liberty — or simply the maintenance of continuing the absence of obstruction regarding any outside encroachments onto property. Property here can be physically material, or, it can be considered as an epistemological relationship towards an embodied ontology as an agent who owns, acts, and does. The radicalization of that relationship implies a level of conflict occurring

— a human conflict — that manifests itself in the immanent critique between external and internal, a continuum of self construction as “for” or “against.” Property becomes the central form to which the immanent critique is defined against; the negotiation between localized ownership and outside ownership forms the basis to the constructed self as an independently acting force. The self’s will to resist is only as radical as it can relate to the environmental, material factors that determine and contain its construction, a central aspect to the human drama as it exists on the fundamental level.

MODIFYING RESISTANCE

ownership of property + movement of radicalization

+

representation of social =
civil disobedience

+

production of identity =
actact

+

capitalization of autonomy =
positive liberty

+

detachment of ownership =
sobriety

+

movement of radicalization =
desiring-production

+

equalization of being =
political mask

+

programming of labor =
negative liberty

AUTHORIZATION

ownership of property + equalization of being

Authorization occurs at the bisection of an ownership and the will to accept responsibility for the flight which it will undergo. To be at the hand of one's own labor is to equalize the functional formations that are able to extend past abstract epistemology. It is the moment of permitting, the moment where that which is owned is allowed to be functional, the being in which that claimant is invested. Authorization is about allowance; there is a conflict of private and public space which is regulated by the hand which labors. Ownership, in this way, becomes that which is connected to that hand: that which dispels from process. Authorization then splits its role between the grant and the recoil. In this split, an ownership becomes a tool that connects an action with its will to power, as well as a revocation of its privileges. With the latter, the privilege was owned in the act of power. Once authorization is conducted,

the receiving end is confronted with the autonomy to create a reaction. Thus, authorization is an act which attempts fully to have an in-itself so that the recoiling might carry forth with consequences. Ethically, authorization is lost during the meta-action, replaced immediately with a will to alternate. Owning the authorization is barely dialectical, and thus barely representable. In the end, it is a fleeting attempt at hierarchies of ownership which undoubtedly must be extended upon further bi-conjectural procedure: authority, resistance, justification, etc.

MODIFYING AUTHORIZATION

ownership of property + equalization of being

+
representation of social =
context

+
production of identity =
episteme

+
capitalization of autonomy =
origin

+
detachment of ownership =
mimesis

+
movement of radicalization =
metafiction

+
movement of radicalization =
subalternation

+
programming of labor =
deontology

SYSTEMIZATION

ownership of property + programming of labor

When considering the ownership of property, it is important to witness the pragmatism inherent in its construct. In this sense, owning something instills a duty to operate and to derive product from its outputting — a signified and proximal gesture. The machinic nature of material reality, including the nexus of epistemological reflexion, connects the object with an array of intensions, or with the componentry that is stabilizing its shape temporally — giving it “life,” panpsychistically speaking. Thus, to deploy labor onto the uses of an owned material (be it body, environment, attributes of design, land, means of production, etc.) is not only to pragmaticize the object, but to loosen — and, by that oppositional virtue, tighten — systems connected to the directed object. Propertizing any materiality directly relates to the systemization that is in constant (repetitious) intercedence of a material

with conceptual acquisition and the labor that is always being done unto it, regardless of conception. Programming a labor onto and unto a cathexial material is a surface performance which tends to ignore the generative nature of systemic organics. Attempting to systemize a static output is perhaps the fundamental aim of both owning and programming objects. However, the systemization does not stop there. The flight from material constraint is not bound by conception; thus, to systemize is to awaken a surplus, even if the semiotic derivation occurs atop the exchange. Systemizing is an intentionality-based operative which is present in the coding of materiality (labor as the fundamental movement of materials) and mimetically concretized in the actions of self upon its tendency to claim and benefit.

MODIFYING SYSTEMIZATION

ownership of property + programming of labor

+
representation of social =
networking

+
production of identity =
expression

+
capitalization of autonomy =
subjugation

+
detachment of ownership =
alienation

+
identification of program =
exegesis

+
movement of radicalization =
technocracy

+
equalization of being =
quietization

AFFIRMATION

production of identity + capitalization of autonomy

Autonomy and identity are symbiotic in their most material form: the will to power is both stimulated and simulated by a will to be as that which it directs. In the case of stimulation, automizing identity means to interspecifically activate the projects of self in regards to a manifestation.

This means that to affix a will to power onto the progresses of a production mechanism would engender a movement that emphasizes, and beneficially yields, the machine as a whole, capitalizing on an identity which performs power. On the other hand, as with the case of simulation, there occurs a taxological division of interior power: an attempt to maintain the application of power as protective systemization. In this sense, the infusion of power into the identity is semitonically administered by the identity, the will to be, thus regulating the autonomy, parachifting the dynamics of the symbiosis. With this, the identity attempts to simulate

the intrinsic prevalence of power, thus subverting will. In both senses of the bi-conjecture, an affirmation occurs as to what the identity is: be it turning inward by a biological distress, or optimizing the two wills in a soft construction of machination.

MODIFYING AFFIRMATION

production of identity + capitalization of autonomy

+

representation of social =
a posteriori

+

ownership of property =
a priori

+

detachment of ownership =
dissent

+

identification of program =
difference

+

movement of radicalization =
eternal return

+

equalization of being =
ceremony

+

programming of labor =
territorialization

DISASSOCIATION

production of identity + detachment of ownership

Detachment from the act of producing, concretizing, or fixing identity is a loosening factor toward self-recontextualization. The effort can potentially lead to either a more advanced accelerated reformatting, or, perhaps most polarity, schizophrenia. Disassociation is by nature a heightened state of perception that questions the semiotic or material relationship between objects or between mind and object. Habit becomes the concretized perceptual/associative process which, in disassociation, is loosened. This can lead to new associative patterns that are either coherently, if not virtuosically, legible; or, their recontextualization delves into a core neurosis as the unfixed identity is lost in unconscious, essential inarticulation. The unknown deconstructions of the desiring-machines that separate or construct psychic investment are reassembled in disassociation — their interchangeable

nature forms the loose production of identity in the subject. To view this flexibly is to understand the inherently social nature of identity production, especially in regards to association that occurs unconsciously. From this point, global understanding of the mobility of identity occurs when evolutionary growth happens at the unconscious, psychosomatic level — where self construction is viewed co-creatively, where the self is detached and pliable, sitting on any continuum of desire, application, or interest.

MODIFYING DISASSOCIATION

production of identity + detachment of ownership

+

representation of social =
quilting point

+

ownership of property =
bricolage

+

capitalization of autonomy =
wish fulfillment

+

identification of program =
schizoanalysis

+

movement of radicalization =
death drive

+

equalization of being =
masquerade

+

programming of labor =
defamiliarization

INTENTIONALITY

production of identity + identification of program

Identifying a program within identity production occurs at the raw moment of intention. Intentionality is the initial dispaachment, the process, of the self's conception of identity, either fixed or in continuum. This can be applied individually or systemically within relational organizations or institutions. Intentionality remarks upon the further programming or institutionalization of action or identity production by commenting on its initial, conceptual, or structural means of identification. Such, production becomes the location, the literal identification of the program, that is reflexively associated back within identity. The process of identification is two-fold here. Firstly, identification of the program is ultimately associated as the germ of the subject's identity; or, the concretization of identity can form the intentionality of the program which is eventually identified into further staticity.

The location of identification can be within (internally known) in regards to how the self views itself. In this way, the program is the internal intuition of reaffirming the necessity of a self-composed image, the image the self constructs to view itself.

The location, or intentional identification, can be external as well; it can exist as an imposed program that is forced or adopted un-examined by the subject.

The tension between the two forms of identification is evident in the malleability of intention itself. The potential energy between external and internal, subject and institution, identity and identification, formulates the crux of a flexible, anarchical consideration of the act of “naming” both self-reflexively and exteriorly.

MODIFYING INTENTIONALITY

production of identity + identification of program

+

representation of social =
democracy

+

ownership of property =
consequentialism

+

capitalization of autonomy =
reevaluation

+

detachment of ownership =
anomie

+

movement of radicalization =
action

+

equalization of being =
surplus

+

programming of labor =
structuralism

REFORM

production of identity + movement of radicalization

The shape of identity is comprehended at the tension between the moment under which it performs and the semiotization that follows. Radicalizing this shape means to either compress the tension, or stress the continuous materiality of all that it cavitates (potentiality). To produce identity under these tensile conditions would cause the disclosure of that which is abeyant within identity, that which is already embedded in identity but latently problematized by epistemological structuring, and would therefore change not only the interconnectivity of its dialogisms, but posit an outward reformation of a moving identity: identity in motu. However, it is important to realize the directionality of movement towards the stressing of a continuum, or into the compression of an isolated comprehension. With the former, identity is reformed in its almost barren traits: the self becomes suspicious as to that which is reforming

it, realizing less its ability to be, and more its arrival at being. In this case, the self is radicalized in its understanding of self, towards a non-being. The latter deals with a stimulation of the locum-of-self; the influence of seemingly exterior system's outputs on self that forms new objects with the self ad infinitum. Thus, the semiotized "self" must always be substituting that self which came before in the previous bio-moment. In either case, there is always the radical reform of identity.

MODIFYING REFORM

production of identity + movement of radicalization

+

representation of social =

Aletheia

+

ownership of property =

initiation

+

capitalization of autonomy =

transgression

+

detachment of ownership =

heteromorphism

+

identification of program =

entryism

+

equalization of being =

apeiron

+

programming of labor =

overthrow

NEUTRALIZATION

production of identity + equalization of being

In media res is a point of entry for understanding the concept of equalization of being as a stasis, a maintenance, and a prospective. For there to be motion occurrent, having a bisection at any point read as a decoded slowing of motion, an equalization must occur via the interaction and in the situation. Identity is perhaps best understood, both by the presumed owner and the onlooker, as an immanent force in media res. The immanence is the productive force of identity, whereas the in media res is the equalization of being: both the singular and the multiplex. Neutralizing the spatiotemporal self by means of a already affluent one, speaking from a place of departure, is the production of equalization, not equality. The difference, found only in the interior of the plane, is that of the suffixal being: we are not attempting to explicate an equal being, but an equalized being who's production of identity is a leveling

before any transient of post-reflexive semiotization.

MODIFYING NEUTRALIZATION

production of identity + equalization of being

+
representation of social =
normality

+
ownership of property =
post-fordism

+
capitalization of autonomy =
impetus

+
detachment of ownership =
innovation

+
identification of program =
neutron

+
movement of radicalization =
stillness

+
programming of labor =
meditation

SUBSTANTIATION

production of identity + programming of labor

Programming labor and production of identity go hand in hand; in short, the labor of an object results in its subjectification. Here we can stress the densities of the program and the labor. Because identity is an entirely radical culmination of micro-reticulation already, the macro-substantiation of identity is the result of infinite programmings. The particular gesture which is accredited in the exchange of a maxima identity contains labor that cannot be expressed with signs. Substantiation here is meant both in its reification form and its emphatic form. In constant subsumption of any structural agency, identity works to be, and also will attempt to be as is: thus, there is conditioning of both analytics and flow. The identity which is will always be multiplied from any form of occurrence by the time that it is as-itself. Substantiation is not a form of self-identification, but rather a dynamism

of identity as a working agent which relays back to “self” after the material facts. The identity is solidified upon impact; form is bread upon transmediate genesis. Programming subjectification is the byproduct of production in general, thus making substantiation a byproduct of subjectification. With this, we aim to accelerate the access points of substantiation: of identity becoming something beyond an in-itself.

MODIFYING SUBSTANTIATION

production of identity + programming of labor

+
representation of social =
utterance

+
ownership of property =
prototype

+
capitalization of autonomy =
exponent

+
detachment of ownership =
abstraction

+
identification of program =
civilization

+
movement of radicalization =
avant-garde

+
equalization of being =
prime

ACCESS

capitalization of autonomy + detachment of ownership

The detachment of ownership from capitalized agency formats the relinquishment of self governance, initiation, independence, or design schemes. Alternatively, detachment from the dependence on autonomy is a practice (or praxis) of activating separation or difference. Access is the resultant sublimation of “owning” autonomy as a means to acquire agency over material or within labor. More pertinently, access refers to the epistemological agency over any given constructive measure as a consistent recontextualization into global space. Concretism can occur through the subject capitalizing on its autonomy to act in a perceptively, statically free manner. Any independently acting subject can subjugate the multiple by proclaiming its difference as an autonomous agent. To detach from the will to capitalize autonomy is a recognition of the deterministic quality of materials,

epistemology, or any unconscious semiotic reference uniting subjects in inherent solidarity. Furthermore, it collectivizes the substance of mind within compassionate acts of sharing what is autonomously owned. Access also refers to when autonomy can be used to actively detach; it isn't simply the recontextualization of the autonomous agent into detachment. Rather, autonomy can be used to actively make a source accessible through sheer will, or through sheer control over a source. Their interplay describes a spectrum between chaos and control, with synthesis occurring in the flexible moment when the self constructs itself to appear publicly as a freely actant entity.

MODIFYING ACCESS

capitalization of autonomy + detachment of ownership

+

representation of social =
unconscious

+

ownership of property =
commonwealth

+

production of identity =
compassion

+

identification of program =
psychoanalysis

+

movement of radicalization =
vulnerability

+

equalization of being =
inalienability

+

programming of labor =
legality

JUSTIFICATION

capitalization of autonomy + identification of program

Identifying the process in which autonomy can be fully capitalized (upon or toward) results is a justification for and of its initial form; it is the description of autonomy as a program. Justification can be understood, perhaps grossly, as the pleasure of agency towards being exercised. The implied dominance exists within the will to power, the will to act freely as an independent force. In ethics, this appears as the actual, intellectual justification for a course of action that was independently exercised, a situation where responsibility is considered only before and after the actant thought. Yet, to consider its use positively, justification also describes the necessity to protect agency as it relates to the individual, or even the accidental. In this sense, its use becomes essential as an actual, descriptive, clear justification for the multiple temporal decisions within a flexible epistemology. Justification involves a deciding process

within self construction, where an action within reformatting is justified in terms of its use, necessity, ethics, or speciality towards a given situation. The act itself intellectualizes the autonomy and has the potential to justify why the action was made, why the phenomenal moment was understood within certain conditions, parameters, or constructions. Within epistemology, justification becomes the formulative process of sorting and arranging, even abstractly, the experience of selfhood as a mentally “autonomous” force. In this sense it attaches it to a process with the potential to extend autonomy, or to describe its differential nature in relation to the total.

MODIFYING JUSTIFICATION

capitalization of autonomy + identification of program

+

representation of social =
apologetics

+

ownership of property =
jouissance

+

production of identity =
Negative Dialectics

+

detachment of ownership =
accidental

+

movement of radicalization =
warfare

+

equalization of being =
empathetics

+

programming of labor =
transcendentalism

AMPLIFICATION

capitalization of autonomy + movement of radicalization

Turning is a concept which both has physical application and semiotic impermanence. For example, turning a profit allows not only for profit, but a bend in the shape of the structures which were in exchange; turning something “up” gestures the dialing of a knob, as well as the dynamization of a hard object bent into a soft one; turning over in a grave semiotizes a misuse of ideation, though it gestures a lateral slant in the shape of a consideration. Thus, when discussing the radicalization of autonomy as a way to capitalize, it is fair to say that the turning of self implies the benefits of self by expanding territories, as well as the bending of self to be that which it must in order to be autonomous. The turned self is an amplification: it emits a register of solidarity, changes velocities of vocalization, and strips back the primal source to be broader in its signaling. The sign which is allowed to amplify becomes

not only a larger sign, but must also add distortion of clarity in order to convey the inherent misdesigns — turning it over to find the malfunction. The movement of this type of signaling is always in exchange between the smallest forms of substance and the largest completions of signification — a move towards total through the use of more.

MODIFYING AMPLIFICATION

capitalization of autonomy + movement of radicalization

+
representation of social =
history

+
ownership of property =
neoliberalism

+
production of identity =
maxima

+
detachment of ownership =
collectivization

+
identification of program =
minima

+
equalization of being =
sublimity

+
programming of labor =
engineering

JUSTICE

capitalization of autonomy + equalization of being

The epitomal application of an equalized, autonomous being takes form as the public or local administration of “a justice.” The philosophical conversation of what is “just” is contemptuous; however, here, we are referring to the manner agency can be equalized for the individual and the public in a flexible, contingent manner. While the obvious and limited view of justice is sociologically and epistemologically embodied in empiricism and social contract theory, we seek to apply it teleologically within its program towards the pliable self as not only free, but programmed into a redesignable figuration. Justice, then, is the means in which equalization is applied constructively towards difference manifesting itself equally regarding a total epistemology. Justice can be the reformative self being equalized within the spectral fold of other selves, arriving at an

epistemological understanding of inherent relationality, uniqueness, and solidarity, which all emanate from that initial growth of what is “just” between their difference and sameness. This can be done actively as the autonomous agent equalizing objects, or mind, through its agency; or, it can be seen reticently as the equalization occurring through the distributive justice occurring between autonomous agents. The idea of “fairness” means little when placed within self construction. Rather, the process of flexibly reformatting an epistemological understanding of self, or objects, results from the deconstructive effort to understand the total mental image of equalization as an overlooking of possible epistemologies. The autonomy which emanates from reformatting, or that is needed for reformatting, demands recontextualization as an action of equalization. Justice can be viewed as an attempt at equilibrium between how the mind autonomously reformats and how this can manifest in balance with a

total perspective of sociality, towards a realization of “itself” as an act of labor.

MODIFYING JUSTICE

capitalization of autonomy + equalization of being

+

representation of social =
consent

+

ownership of property =
due process

+

production of identity =
pro bono publico

+

detachment of ownership =
discrimination

+

identification of program =
minima

+

movement of radicalization =
sublimity

+

programming of labor =
engineering

REGULATION

capitalization of autonomy + programming of labor

A sort of conclusion to the narrative of autonomy, the “autonomous” programming labor is a stimulation of the measures taken to withstand exhaustion. With the other six modifications, autonomy can become a project of deference, exhausting the chaoses of autonomy, capitalizing on the spectrums of potential anchorings within any horizontalization. Instead, with programming labor, there is move to regulate the capitalization so that the optimum emphasis is made. For example, the narrowing in on a labor task or system is a seeking out of autonomous communication; the act of allowing externalizations to promote autonomy is tuned rather than energizing from the murmuring of a multitude. Regulating input in order to stimulate understanding is a highly functional and disciplined action. When applied to epistemology, regulation streamlines the communicative

tendency of the work-at-hand and attempts to yield reified results. The obscurant of this motive is the paradoxical exhaustion of autonomy which is rejoined. Motility protects the conception of totality for typically archipelagic disconnect, and regulating motility champions an endurance of epistemological reach. This is exhausting and tends to connect systems so tightly that when the production is achieved, the search for new order must be met with transitive untangling.

MODIFYING REGULATION

capitalization of autonomy + programming of labor

+
representation of social =
censorship

+
ownership of property =
design

+
production of identity =
diegesis

+
detachment of ownership =
autoscopy

+
identification of program =
filtration

+
movement of radicalization =
despotism

+
equalization of being =
authenticity

DISCIPLINE

detachment of ownership + identification of program

Discipline involves the realization of the program of detachment. It involves the identification of a program within an epistemological detachment from a given referent. Its application places a constraint upon localized acts of detachment, continuing the process into further programming that leads to its disciplined use. Detachment, as a moment, is epistemologically realized temporally, a moment in time regarding the particular; yet, its procedural nature develops it into an orientation which is extended through specific, controlled decisions. Abilities flow from this orientation that are reformatted in opposition to a previous embodiment or construction of self. Its flexible format involves discipline being used for multiple ends or goals outside of a single framework — its application can be specific to a particular goal, and quickly rearranged to suit the anterior with equal affect. The modularity of discipline enhances

the identified program to be pliable to innumerable conditions that are sought; it enhances a sameness between the method of discipline and any given concretized construction of self that may be taking place. Yet, its application often involves self-control that furthers the self's staticity, or even stoicism, as an agent that trusts the program it has designed to enhance paths toward detachment.

MODIFYING DISCIPLINE

detachment of ownership + identification of program

+

representation of social =
class consciousness

+

ownership of property =
false consciousness

+

production of identity =
dogma

+

capitalization of autonomy =
theosophy

+

movement of radicalization =
asceticism

+

equalization of being =
becoming

+

programming of labor =
singularity

EXODUS

detachment of ownership + movement of radicalization

Relation is a differential induction when the attachments of the multiple are forced to mobilize. The condensation of space is often forced to include relation as a differential induction, and when an object is removed from within, the movement radicalizes the difference. By this, it is meant that the network of connection will sustain under small interpolations of positive and negative relations; their diversity is attached to the same process. Radicalizing that attachment, or meaning to detach from it, is perhaps impossible, or perhaps always occurring. Exodus might mean the failure of memory, the absence of other, the change of formation. The application we are moving to produce here is one that trips the interpolation by displacing the abscissa in an oblique way, one that cannot be traced by the process which functions under the reasons for its system. This allows for the extreme non-being of a representable form; it is

alike but does not perform participation. Thus, detachment as a radical state is a movement not away or towards, but of extraction and rearrangement of connective faculties, lost to the beings which are eager for covalence.

MODIFYING EXODUS

detachment of ownership + movement of radicalization

+
representation of social =
icon

+
ownership of property =
relativism

+
production of identity =
covalence

+
capitalization of autonomy =
homo sacer

+
identification of program =
lines of flight

+
equalization of being =
existentialism

+
programming of labor =
ex nihilo

NOTHINGNESS

detachment of ownership + equalization of being

Finding equalization within detachment is a consideration of the entire liquidated epistemology toward non-metaphysics: a topology of nothingness. The complicated task of detaching from being, or an equalization therein, forms the basis for a “relative nothingness” that is found in self’s negation of being. Equalization is also found within the fluid state of detachment itself; such, nothingness could be concretized within a transcendental, structural state of affairs that fuses both the noetic and nematic dimensions of epistemology. Consciousness, the motivator which constructs aspects of self, and the arbiter that allows for flexible construction, is modally represented in an inherent existentialism that measures reality in terms of its being — the possibility of life or death. The understanding of a nothingness can form the raw material for the self’s ability to liquidate and reformat into

further moments of realization; and, its consideration allows for a transcendent inter-subjectivity that does not rely on schematized categorical formulation. Rather, it can be “considered” as an ontological reality that emanates from a limited view of a raw epistemology constituted from nothingness, begetting the same. Agency is liquidated by negating the idea of a true individual, only allowing for the solidarity of an epistemological, existential, or emptied freedom that infinitely liquidates the self into total, new, definitive futures.

MODIFYING NOTHINGNESS

detachment of ownership + equalization of being

+
representation of social =
postmodernism

+
ownership of property =
non-place

+
production of identity =
vitalism

+
capitalization of autonomy =
freedom

+
identification of program =
absurdity

+
movement of radicalization =
noema

+
programming of labor =
totality

CONCEPTION

detachment of ownership + programming of labor

Embedded in a concept lies the proto-sequences of participation, or, how to adapt to the program which is fully operative. For the conceiver who regards strings of ideation as a closed system, conception neither pushes nor pulls matters of difference. In this sense, it can be said that the program above which concepts are articulated is only imminent by the entrancement of difference. The concept must not contend the difference, nor rewrite the program. In fact, to attempt these would be to exhaust language in a noble act which does not have syntax. Conception must participate in the maneuvering of staticity: detached from the mandates of languages but immanent to that which will. Thus, conception is a perpetually free-form use-machine, always riding the differences to synthesize the compositions of realized sequences. Conceiving, in a sense, triggers the sequences that do not conflict, but

that do offer irreducible expanses of reach. Concept can be considered the envelope for consideration. The thought, the anecdote, the archetype, are all filtered by the perpetuity of concept and, thus, will attempt to derail it. However, in an acrobatic essentiality, the concept will form itself in the molds of programmatic totality and, when the differences of enveloping attach to the potential meaning, the concept will reform, detached at all points of the wave on which it is carried.

MODIFYING CONCEPTION

detachment of ownership + programming of labor

+

representation of social =
multitude

+

ownership of property =
repetition

+

production of identity =
deception

+

capitalization of autonomy =
spitit

+

identification of program =
allegorization

+

movement of radicalization =
spontaneous generation

+

equalization of being =
reincarnation

PRECISION

identification of program + movement of radicalization

A programming system, as a potentially applicative function, is designed to enhance the repetition or quality of the inherent function the self is meaning to construct or act upon. Radicalizing the identification of a program is to know and understand a methodology of enhancement. Precision describes the radicalization of an understanding of method into exactitude; its realization is within a definitive program that further constructs various modes of self, radically, or definitively unto itself. Such, precision is the applied form of systemization without the necessary adherence to an axiomatic entirety. Its use rests upon the sole purpose of exactly addressing a specific concern or project deftly. When applied to self construction, precision is perhaps best viewed as the focused identification of a practiced method to receive expected results. In this way, the program itself can be radicalized to extremely describe the

content at hand. Alternatively, movements of radicalization can seek out a program to reach its own goals. This creates the visible, emblematic representation of radicalization as an identifiable program. The radical becomes united in its will to program itself as an applicable force.

MODIFYING PRECISION

identification of program + movement of radicalization

+
representation of social =
rhetoric

+
ownership of property =
aesthetics

+
production of identity =
style

+
capitalization of autonomy =
rationalism

+
detachment of ownership =
sacrifice

+
equalization of being =
synthesis

+
programming of labor =
logic

CATEGORIZATION

identification of program + equalization of being

There are no lattice points upon the mesh of realism. In the moment of semiotic singularity, a multiplicity will uprise, overthrowing stationary notes upon moving charts. How, then, does one become without the true idealist formations of static semiosis? Is there a semiotic register which neither represents nor describes past as present? With this regard, we are looking into the equalization of a process: identifying a program. It is not as if there is a coding pattern which can be read in full, mimicked in full, and, thus, predicted in full. Programs morph out of and into apparatuses at a rate which removes the semiotic aim at knowing which is which. Adding concepts upon the expanses of programs is not effective in disarming or intersecting the program: it is merely a mechanism for deriving meaning. The move to derive meaning is not a lattice

point, for the idealism is never met, for the counterargument which contains nihilism can dislocate it, drawing lines in all directions. Instead, we filter to sidestep the dialectic which is incredibly oppressive upon living, by deriving meaning in the implosion upon program achievement, passive programming, and program malfunction. The univocity of the three is not a dramatic display of uni-substance, but rather a quiet assessment of experience; it returns radical anarchy to its right to a derivable meaning. We posit that categorization, a sub-semiotic moment of identification, does not place finitude upon a material act, but rather allows for the program to be read — regardless of indecipherability — and be discarded just the same: an equalization. It should be said though that what is done with reading is not a categorical prerogative.

MODIFYING CATEGORIZATION

identification of program + equalization of being

+

representation of social =
civility

+

ownership of property =
genetics

+

production of identity =
familialization

+

capitalization of autonomy =
republic

+

detachment of ownership =
separation of powers

+

movement of radicalization =
instinct

+

programming of labor =
divisions of labor

REASON

identification of program + programming of labor

When identification is systematically brought within the program of labor, it develops a replicative process for pursuing an understanding of self outside of what can be immediately known. Philosophical reasoning, when applied to self construction, must be considered on a scale outside immediate perception — and within the context to which it is/ was programmed. Considering reason is within the structure of a laboring program, we must notice their intertwinement as the arbiter of a truth-process. Reason's ability to reach beyond the construction of self, to reach a "transcendent" truth-process, a separate epistemology between human beings, is essential for the dialectical process of flexible outreach regarding the grander act of human knowledge or wisdom. The limitations of reason are evident in the spaces between unconscious perception, between self constructive

processes occurring in tandem with each other. Such, how can reason exist within a flexible, reformattable epistemology? Reason can be shared as a program of labor. Its effort to concretize what is known as an application unto totality is merely a program which reaches outward to hold or maintain a sharable truth. In this sense, reason can only be flexible as merely a guide for our work; its application is the identification of a program which seeks further programmability within labor. It cannot be considered the grand design for epistemology. Although it can be utilized for maintaining “world wholes” that are cosmologically evident and universally asserted — its manifestation is only within the relational aspect to loosen the mind that interacts within, towards a potential awakening of thought-programs.

MODIFYING REASON

identification of program + programming of labor

+

representation of social =
subjectification

+

ownership of property =
objectivity

+

production of identity =
diversity

+

capitalization of autonomy =
positivism

+

detachment of ownership =
scientific method

+

movement of radicalization =
entropy

+

equalization of being =
symbiosis

ACCELERATED REFORMATTING

movement of radicalization + equalization of being

Radicalizing equalization is a reformative processes in movement and in equilibrium — a seeding construction found within the tactical progression of mind embodied within semiosis, labor, detachment, and reattachment. It is the pliable motion to will a staticity within constant movement. The attribution is within the manipulative synapse-structure of a moving, laboring mind. The flight-of-self forms the initial radical decision to dispatch multiple loci-of-selves that matriculate from the desire to stabilize as a renewable mental resource. The system of an epistemology attempts to produce a latent product, the constructed self, as a coherent vision a temporally shifting, blind-sided mind. Acceleration is inherent to recognizing, radicalizing, and ultimately equalizing within an ecosystemic intensity of self that realizes its contingency upon the influence of potential systems or operating forces. The forces are known only temporarily,

yet they consistently contain the live self. It is this recognition of containment, and the material realism and structural influence therein, that allows the flight to dissolve within multiplicitous coexisting relationships. These relationships are softly constructed by the acceleration of disrupting the concretic attachment to a specific format. This inherently disruptive performativity is radical in its cyclical destruction of its own devices that cause latency or staticity; yet, with its movement comes an equalization of being synonymous with a consistently detached, reattachable, “soft” construction.

MODIFYING ACCELERATED REFORMATTING

movement of radicalization + equalization of being

+

representation of social =
social drift / global market

+

ownership of property =
posthumanism

+

production of identity =
intelligence amplification

+

capitalization of autonomy =
surfing

+

detachment of ownership =
altered sense ratios

+

identification of program =
sensorium

+

programming of labor =
cybernetics

ANARCHY

movement of radicalization + programming of labor

The programming of radicalized movements within a labor structure form anarchical landscapes where work sublimates “the radical” within its means of production; through production, the programming of self becomes re-combinative. Self is leaderless in flight. Its hierarchy is horizontalized as all radical avenues are seen within the module of work as the radical, reconstructive force. Phenomenal formatting is tied implicitly within the redirectable moment of labor, as the inherent similarity of all possible constructions converge within the necessity of labor itself. The particular energy of the accelerated agent is seen within any continuum of anarchical solidarity between possible self constructions. This type of pliancy refers to the organic fluidity of self as detached from fixation — be it through belligerence, institution, logic, or experiment. The

experimental self-construction is sublimated within the programming of labor; it is heavily specified, implemented, and computed within a specific action taking place precisely according to its design. Thus, the peripheral decision to radicalize, one subject to the likening of semiotics, becomes evident in the production of and relationship between material objects having effect on mind through labor. The means of production creates new radical patterns, further establishing a force with agency —a growth known softly to humanity that acts interchangeably within the loose spaces between self and material.

MODIFYING ANARCHY

movement of radicalization + programming of labor

+

representation of social =
locum-of-self

+

ownership of property =
syndicalism

+

production of identity =
horizontalization

+

capitalization of autonomy =
isocracy

+

detachment of ownership =
fragmentation

+

identification of program =
dérive

+

equalization of being =
univocity

FLEXIBILITY

equalization of being + programming of labor

We end with flexibility appropriately because within it, or better yet through it, lay the other 35 filters attempting to bend under the weight of their implicit oppositions. Though there is no need to narrow the flexibility of flexibility, we arrive at a bi-conjecture which is incredibly difficult to staticize. Equalizing under the programming of labor is ultimately a trans concept; if labor is the residual of a movement of materials (a labor in itself), then there is inherent equalization in the qualia of reformatting. Again, we will stress the importance of understanding equalization as a midway point between that which it is modifying — in this case, the programming of labor. Thus, the subtlety of programming labor is magnified at the stage of flexibility. Form, shape, density, networking, flight, etc. are all completely unsure on the tick of program as it labors

with intensity and extensity. Applying flexibility to epistemology ensures that the knowingness of a substance is almost entirely at the turning of a flexible program: one that changes itself and its directive simultaneously. Knowing, then, must be a flexible -archy and -ology.

This is both solipsistic and idealist in its endeavor: to know is more than to not know, it is to flexibly be unknown and known under a simultaneity that is also flexibly unsure of whether its temporal conflictions are knotting or untying.

Flexibility is a labor which extends itself from all comprehensions, around that which refuses it and into that which takes it — a soft construction with unrelenting movement of the real.

MODIFYING FLEXIBILITY

equalization of being + programming of labor

+
representation of social =
communicative action

+
ownership of property =
collaborative economics

+
production of identity =
mechanical reproduction

+
capitalization of autonomy =
soft subversion

+
detachment of ownership =
nomadology

+
identification of program =
functional plasticity

+
movement of radicalization =
velocity

a conclusion of A Flexible Anarchy

Anarchy occurs as the result of irreducible labor performing within a system that does not contain absolutes. This contradiction — that an object or subject can be irreducible yet simultaneously lacking in absolutes — is both anarchical in its logic as well as in the exchange that ultimately semiotizes an “anarchy” symbol — a symbol which is known by most as a non-state, presumably a state of chaos. This is prime syntax for contradiction. However, we find and hopefully show that this is neither an absolute chaos nor a useless one, for it is bound to a labor which is unyielding, a labor that is not absolute but rather the carrier for repetitious change. Ever-changing shapes of materials remove the base for absolutes, but can be linguistically assumed as an absolute in itself, though our model removes the in itself. Our defense works to challenge any notion of concretism as anything more than a placeholder, one that is immediately substituted in infinite repetition. The self is that which is in articulation. With this, we move to show the sessility of forms broken from their location, not to challenge their flight as a complication of life, but to demonstrate that it was already in movement — an autopoiesis as labor. Ultimately, anarchy is the acceleration of sessile signifiers. Anarchy mobilizes staticity, reflexing a loss of statics, or “self.” It formats the difference and does not iterate into uniformity after breaking from the initial unification to reach difference. Anarchy adds extra semiotic processes which account for constant movement (continuum) regardless of the language which attempts to confuse its density

with immobility. Anarchy is always happening in the sense that there are free-roaming objects attempting that autopoietic labor in an accelerated movement of non-absolutes. What we are articulating is not the lack of system; after all, we can witness networkings that build the likeness of absolutes — especially epistemological concretism. Rather, we are emphasizing the free-form reformatting of objects as being the system which binds the object to a taxonomy of oneness inside of an unconditional expanse of interior and exterior difference. This necessitates our focus on the concept of filtration, the tools of epistemology used in the occurrence of self which offer degrees of proximal materials that combine to form dense objects. These dense objects are not to be confused with absolutes. Rather, the paraphrastic properties of the object will bridge the gap between the surpluses of arrangement and non-existence. It is for this reason that our flexible anarchy exists on the cusp of so many philosophical impressions that, without the momentums of reformatting, would seem to be conflicting or even non-applicable.

The system that is in motion is a combinatory arrangement that includes fluency of abstraction and form within that motion. In this sense, politics is merely a particular arrangement within this system, thus making our version of anarchy less institutional than it is en garde towards the mass containment of acknowledgements per a substantiation of self. Any possible institution would be one of an arrangement with the will to be. This is a highly reflexive

position to be in, necessitating either a knowing or unknowing of signs and mappings of previous lines. Anarchy within this system would function within the “known” end of signs and mapping: it focuses on the points of departure and the approaching potentialities for filtering localizations of sensational input. Unknowing is of interest as well, and, anarchical functionality is not removed from it. The unknown is not systemically able to semiotize the reformat. In this way, this anarchy is two-fold, and the flexibility is in reference to each, or rather, functions as the mediation of the two. The first is that of natural motion of materials. This occurs regardless of influence. There is impetus and there is change based on potentially drawn lines, although the line drawn must move away from itself regardless of its strength of reference. This is where theory might try to place an absolute, for form naturally has opposing machinic forces. It is here that we would find pre-Socratic concepts of universality, even up to any atomos, as well as any realism concerned with physical and material exposition. Anarchy would refer to the material capacity to move, obstructed only by a proximal density, rather than the signs of those densities which result in falsified expectation and avoidance. Any theory that suggests that forms rearrange because they are in-themselves supposed to be for any reason, other than a spatiotemperance within an unknowing or non-syntaxis, will inlay axiomatics from a place of hierarchy and thus dominance. To avoid this, we are insuring the flight of materials as an action of articulation rather than a

reactionary resistance.

The second anarchy would then be one that builds structural assertion regarding both approaches to material movement. The planate view of movement with horizontalized autonomy is based on proximal arrangement and the hierarchical view of purpose as a particularizing measure potentiating absolutes. By the nature of situation, there are systemic outputs which derive a type of signification and mapping that we semiotize with consciousnesses, epistemologies, and, even ontologies. It is at this very crossing that we must place a view of anarchy again. The materials moving, regardless of approach, become sensitive — patternistic, probabilistic, pragmatic, and, therefore, become accustomed to virtual systems that output arrangements with the possibility of introjecting either common symbol or experienced symbol. Once the symbol is thought, it does not conflict with the first anarchy, but rather extends from its comprehension. By this, we mean that a semiotization of flight does not create hierarchy, but furthers the individual form's planar expansion. If one was to analyze the hierarchical foundation extending itself into reflexive symbolism, then embedded in the symbols themselves are valuations that are derived from previously institutionalized aggregation or use. This is the work of many creative laborers developing concepts of deconstruction, idealism, and even pragmatisms that move towards optimizing "reality." Attempting to remove the hierarchy of symbols does not produce a hierarchy in its very occurrence; it is

merely an act of movement. We are not, like most might read it, removing the virtuality. Rather, we are rerouting it in and out of the same materialist movement we give to the system which produces it, much like the system which produces the body, the orbit, the automobile, the seed, etc. The virtual here would describe the surplus of an object, which is what the entirety of epistemology is grounded in — knowing as a demonstrative correlationism with a program of affirmation. The surplus is very important then for the type of material anarchy we are confronted with when we introduce symbols as further branchings of systemic outputting. If an object is always materially disrupting any shape which it was previously occupying, the symbol so too will disrupt shape. This is not accounting for the new symbols that import the line of the one in flight. Flight disrupts their shape until the symbol stretches too far for its own exchange to contain any previous features. The surplus of both the arrangement and the symbolic holdings are in no way bound to itself. Thus, we suggest an anarchical program that is directly extended from the first anarchy discussed, linking the material which is horizontal with the symbol that appears to be superimposed, adjacent, or worse, above. This anarchy does not pay attention to where the virtual application of the symbol lies, because it ultimately is established in the planate material movement. The anarchy is that which horizontalizes symbols alongside materials, and then uses them in accordance to the arrangement of potentials natural to the areal density. The system, or institution if more

relevant to the symbol, and confronts the symbol of anarchy. The symbol paraphrases the system itself in order to hierarchize, and thus, restrict the freedom bestowed in the natural freedom of movement.

For instance, the paraphrasic tendency is to attribute the consumption of alcohol by a human as that of becoming drunk. One becomes drunk, which would semiotically reference a narrow transmutation: the self is the same, modified by the drunk. There is no language that allows for the change of the self during the staging of being drunk, because it is an almost non-projection: the self is still but with the temporary modifier, assuming either a return to normalcy, and ignoring any non-analytical accumulation wherein the modification changed the self, results in an inability to return fully. Moreover, in the paraphrasing of any alteration of self, the procedural return to normalcy is that of sleeping it off and awaking to 1. being drunk no more, and 2. exhibiting hangover symptoms. The post-sleep departure of the modifier is a sort of “sun will rise” refutation of solipsism: a cheap shot which so too generalizes the molar changing of materials and their positions. The hangover stage is then a second modifier of the experience which is not in linearity with the same, but more differential resulting from. In this way, responsibility is allowed to drift since it is a new system of modification; the filtering is completely different because the semiotic retiform contains a separate body of proximal materials.

This demonstrates a few strange positions taken pre-an anarchical approach to the second tier described as any symbolic influence on movement — the concept of the modified self. We accept symbols to account for the change of epistemology; to be asleep, drowsy, sick — that which directly affects self but can be seen as a temporary filtration due to a modification. Again, a symbol has its own real surplus. The modification demonstrates a view of the lack of syntax involved in pre-anarchistic reformatting. There is the drunken human that is in modified form for as long as the intoxication lasts. There is an expectance of return to normalcy. However, the most interesting point is that of the return to normalcy as being only an addition of symbolic lines that trace the folds of the intoxication. The concept of actual change is not part of any semiotics surrounding the event. Thus, we arrive at our study, and perhaps, a philosophy.

Our take on the object-arrangement which is embedded in the epistemological position considers this human as such; the intoxication as such; the sleeping as such; the hangover as such; and ultimately, the constant change from stage to stage as such. Further, within those larger symbols, we move to drift the episteme constantly, which is how we derive at the locum-of-self: the drift as a flight from self-to-self. Not only is the intoxication an additive intension to the “self” comprehension, the environment; the particle mutation; etc. so too push the self outside of a previous shape into a new one. Though it is seemingly impossible — and based on this analogy of

intoxication, made so by the conditions themselves — we are pushing to semiotize the symbols of the loci within an anarchical continuum just like the material which bares its existence.

In our study, we designed nine filters. The nine filters are structural gestures we use to represent the catalysis of change, flight, locum, material movement, etc. For example, the ownership of property filter is one that must always be in symbolic revolt, for the amount of abstract narrowification of hierarchy is easily read as illegitimate the moment it is decoded per bio-moment. The filters are then not absolutes, but malleable trends of organization, much like any catalyst. We then attempted to show the insular sensitivity of each filter's degree of filtering by designing bi-conjectures. It does not matter what systems are being bi-conjectured, their symbolic stability will immediately become — or had already been in multiple ways through acceleration — destabilized, forming concepts which are finite in their reach, but infinite in their abstraction. We chose to further dilute the systemic symbols by modifying the bi-conjectures with a third unit. Even though the symbols which we use to build epistemology are highly diluted and destabilized, they seem to be systemized continuously into concretized absolutes. Our study wanted to demonstrate that reality is built out of the same materials, and filtering part of it using the symbolic capacities allows for differences which thus allow for modes of being. However, the flexibility of the filters could bend to include the

tri-conjectural outcomes in any form. Our outcomes were the work of philosophical induction, and the capacity of another reasoning-set should derive different symbols. Symbolic overlay is not affective, but is extensive: accelerationally extended whence it came. The anarchy we end up with is one of 1. lateral materials moving with their labor, the system that they are anarchic towards, 2. symbol movement that neither absolutizes the subject nor maintains its composure, drawn in a flight of relation, and 3. one of actual semiotic intention, pushing the symbol to reformat in an erasure of a centralized front, instead institutionalized with the total orientation of materials by the excursion of flight.